ED 175 791 SO 011 959

TITLE The Continuing Education of William Carr. An Autobiography.
INSTITUTION National Education Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 449p.: Out of print from NEA

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Biographies; *Educational History; Educational Needs; Educational Practice; Elementary Secondary Education; Interests; National Organizations; Opinions; *Professional Associations; *Teacher Associations; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS Carr (William G)

ABSTRACT

Written as a personal memoir of educator William Carr and as an historical perspective on the National Education Association (NEA) from the late 1920s to the 1970s, this biography focuses on Dr. Carr's devotion to education and to the rational solution of international differences. As an active member of the NEA for nearly 40 years, as Executive Secretary of NEA from 1952-1967, and as a member of the Educational Policies Commission from 1937-1967, Carr's involvement in education spanned national and international events such as the Great Depression, World War II, and the Cold War. Major achievements of the NEA under Carr's leadership include creation of NEA regional offices, employment of consultants on teacher salaries, strengthening of NEA's research division, creation of numerous fellowships for teachers and students, support for teachers' rights, and extension of the program of NEA's Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities. The biography concludes with enumeration of Dr. Carr's activities since his retirement in 1972, including graduate teaching, conference speaking, and active involvement with various professional education associations. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED175791

The Continuing Education of
WILLIAM CARR
An Autobiography

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NEA

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SO 011 959

nea
National Education Association
Washington, D.C.

Note:

The opinions expressed in this publication should not be construed as representing the policy or position of the National Education Association. This material is the personal, unedited viewpoint of an educator who was significantly involved in NEA from 1929 through 1968.

Copyright © 1978
National Education Association of the United States

Stock No. 1399-9-00

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Carr, William George, 1901-
The continuing education of William Carr.

1. Carr, William George, 1901- 2. National Education Association of the United States.
3. Educators–United States–Biography. I. Title.
LA2317.C33A32 370'.92'4 [B] 78-9918
ISBN 0-8106-1399-9

First Edition

Dedicated with love and gratitude
to Elizabeth Vaughan Carr

Preface

The Continuing Education of William Carr is a memoir of the career of an educator whose nearly forty-year association with the National Education Association spanned such major national and international events as the Great Depression, World War II, and the uneasy peace that we know as the Cold War. For sixteen years Dr. Carr was Executive Secretary of the NEA, and in this autobiography he discusses many of the issues that continue to evolve as critical concerns for teachers today. His account is a personal one, however, and as such is not intended to be interpreted as a statement of current NEA policy. Rather, it gives a historical perspective on events and attitudes that contributed to national policy, as well as that of the NEA, between 1929 and 1968.

Dr. Carr's description of the founding and development of the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession, one of whose fundamental tenets is the maintenance of peace through the education of the world's youth, shows a singular devotion to both education and the rational solution of international differences. His tireless work throughout the world as Secretary-General, and later President, of WCOTP is a lasting testament to his personal dedication to world peace.

Contents

Foreword 1

1 Schooling in England, Canada, and California 3

2 Teaching and Graduate Study 18

3 Research, Recession, Recovery 36

4 Educational Policies Commission: Five Basic Documents 54

5 Educational Policies Commission: War and Post-War 74

6 The United Nations and UNESCO 94

7 Endicott and Glasgow 116

8 WOTP: Endicott to Malta 128

9 WCOTP: 1953, 1954, 1955, 1956 148

10 WCOTP: 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962 174

11 WCOTP: 1963, 1964, 1965 195

12 WCOTP: 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969 225

13 WCOTP: 1970, 1971, 1972 258

14 The NEA: Press and Public Relations 272

15 Federal School Legislation 298

16 Civil Rights 343

17 Independence of the Teaching Profession 369

18 Better Instruction 392

19 NEA: General Administration 408

20 Evaluation 433

Foreword

In his essay on *Aspects of Biography,* André Maurois extends little comfort to such as I. He says (correctly, alas) that men forget. What we think we remember of our childhood may be in fact no more than the recollections of what parents and other elders told us about *their* recollections and therefore subject to a double danger of error. Our minds, without exception as far as my experience extends, tend to suppress disagreeable memories, especially as we try to protect our companions in the events we describe.

Whatever he may have thought about the intentions of the observant Boswell, Samuel Johnson thought poorly of biography in general. Not a single biography of any English man of letters, Johnson said severely to Mr. M'Queen in Skye, had been well written–not one. It was essential, he insisted, to include the author's opinions about his own works. Sweeping onward to a still wider generalization, Dr. Johnson declared in so many words that "Every man's life may be best written by himself." The stubborn Boswell was in no way diverted from his purpose by this edict.

Doctor Johnson, however, continued to stress the high value of autobiography: "The writer of his own life has at least the first qualification of an historian, the knowledge of the truth." Although admitting "that his temptations to disguise the truth are equal to his opportunity of knowing it," Johnson still insisted that "Impartiality may be expected with equal confidence from him that relates the passages of his own life, as from him that delivers the transactions of another."

Helen Keller presumably wrote her *Story of My Life* in the hope that her experience might help people facing problems similar to hers. As it turned out, however, her autobiography has helped many people who had no combination of handicaps comparable to hers. Thus, I too, although very few people have been placed in situations exactly like mine, may hope that it may be helpful to view some of the development of education in this country and elsewhere through the lens of my personal experience.

Indeed, my original intention was to write a history of education in the twentieth century, illuminated by recollections of my own experience as part of that history. In this I know I have not succeeded. So I must, like Cardinal Newman in this respect only, offer my own *Apologia pro Vita Mea,* taking comfort from the observation of Henry Sienkiewicz: "A man who leaves memoirs, whether well or badly written, provided they be sincere, renders a service to future psychologists and writers."

1 Schooling in England, Canada, and California

Mind-expansion trip – Learning to read and write but not to sew – Some advantages in Canadian education – Walking and working – Advantages of working in a college library – Academic catastrophes and goal adjustments – Changing courses in mid-stream – Influences and consequences

Perhaps the most important single event in my formal education happened in 1916 when I was fifteen and had just entered Manual Arts High School in Los Angeles. Miss Nellie Stephens, my teacher in a course on Ancient History, assigned each member of the class a different topic for a paper to be written over the weekend. My assignment was "The Roman Chariot Races."

I stayed after class to ask Miss Stephens how I was supposed to assemble the necessary information for this literary effort. "Why don't you go to the library?" she suggested. I said I would do so and asked her where it was. She gave me the address of a branch of the Los Angeles Public Library, just off Moneta Avenue, a half-mile from my home.

Mind-expansion trip

I knew what the word "library" meant, but only as an abstract idea. I do not think I had ever in my life *seen* a collection of more than a dozen volumes other than school textbooks. My family had arrived in Los Angeles from a small town in Canada. My father had a Bible, a Bible Commentary, a book called *The Brook and Its*

Banks, G.A. Henty's *Brave Lads and Gallant Heroes, Pilgrim's Progress,* and a volume of poems by Robert Browning. That was about all, except that once on a never-to-be-forgotten birthday, my Uncle Fred sent me a book called *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer.* These few books were read repeatedly.

On Saturday morning I was waiting for the Branch Library to open. It was, I now realize, a very small branch, a mere twig of a library, located on the ground floor in space designed for a shop of some kind, with display windows facing on the sidewalk. I had no idea how one was supposed to use a library and I was more impressed by the sight of the few hundred books in the converted store than I was, many years later, by the baroque glitter of the grand staircase of the Library of Congress, or the impressive exhibits of the Bodleian at Oxford.

The hard-pressed librarian, between her clerical and custodial duties, found a few minutes to point out the appropriate sections of the collection, to introduce me to the card catalogue and the encyclopedic reference works, and to show me the pencil sharpener. I fell upon that collection as a starving man might attack a meal, in a rush, with no thought of sequence, pudding before salad, entrée before soup. I read as though someone might suddenly snatch the books away from before my eyes. My notes on the Roman Circus accumulated in a fierce concentration of hand and mind, oblivious of surroundings.

About five o'clock that afternoon, the librarian tapped me on the shoulder. "Closing time," she said, and then, smiling, "You did not stop even for lunch." The thunder of the chariot wheels and the shouts of the crowd at the Circus Maximus faded and I returned abruptly from what users of other forms of mind-expansion would today call "a trip." I gathered my notes, hurried home in the late afternoon sunlight, and found my mother anxiously considering whether to notify the police missing persons bureau.

I wrote my report on "The Roman Chariot Races" the next day and handed it to Miss Stephens on Monday. She marked it "A." I wish I had that paper now. It was nearly fifty years later that I saw, in the motion picture "Ben Hur," a chariot race which could compete with the episode I have just related.

If I were required to select the precise point at which I first became aware of what education could mean, what excitement there is in ideas, what enjoyment in the orderly discovery and graceful arrangement of information, that branch library would serve better than any other locale. I think it would be difficult for anyone who had not grown up, as I did, literate but not well-read, to understand the first impact of an open, well-arranged library on the mind of a growing boy.

Of course my schooling had been proceeding for about eight years before I went to the Moneta Branch Library. No doubt, much that happened to me that day was made possible by the learning of the previous years.

Learning to read and write but not to sew

I learned to read at about five years of age in a municipal school in Northampton, England, the city in which I was born in 1901. I can summon only a few memories of my first and, as it turned out, my only year in an English school. I think I was afraid much of the time. The older children seemed to me very noisy, very rough, very *big*. However, I learned to read and write, the latter skill being evidenced by some childish essays. With a care that an archeologist might lavish on the Dead Sea Scrolls or a scholar of Elizabethan literature on the discovery of the missing text of the early "Hamlet," my mother preserved these writings. I still have them. As for reading, I believe I did well, for my teacher gave me on my departure a child's small story book—another memento of my first steps in education,which I still possess.

There is (or at least there was in 1938) one other bit of evidence that I once passed through the school in Northampton. There was an older boy who used to alternately intimidate and infuriate me by pushing me at inopportune moments. I was drinking from a metal cup, attached by a chain to the brick wall beside the water tap in the corridor, when he pushed my back so that my face and the cup were smashed vigorously into the wall. It hurt me enough to make me remember the event.

We left Northampton in 1907 and I did not return to the city of my birth until 1938. School was in session in the same building. A metal cup still hung by a chain against the wall. The cup was old, very old, and on the outside, just below the rim, were two slight indentations of the size and shape that might be formed by a child's lower incisors. Everything else about the school seemed somehow to have been changed. The rooms, the hallways, the playground—were all much smaller than my memory expected. But the cup seemed to be about the right size. I wonder if it still hangs there. Perhaps not; perhaps the local education authority has by now installed drinking fountains.

I have one other pedagogical recollection of my first school days. We were all, boys and girls alike, given instruction in sewing. I do not say we all *learned to sew*; we were *given instruction.* There is a difference. We were supposed to begin by making stitches with black thread on white cloth. When that exercise was satisfactorily done, blue stitches and then red stitches were made. The culmination of the course was to hemstitch a handkerchief. I remained a severely retarded black-thread user for the entire term. I did not *want* to learn to sew. While others gaily hemstitched handkerchiefs to be proudly shown at home, I continued grimly to make very uneven black stitches.

By a long-shot coincidence, Sir Alec Clegg, Education Officer of the Yorkshire West Riding County Council, has found and recently published part of the syllabus used in the late nineteenth century to train English teachers to teach small children "The Principles and Practice of Needlework." I give here *verbatim* a few delicious examples of this method which my own teacher followed in 1906-07.

Needle Drill

Apparatus: Baby threaders and knitting cotton or very course cotton

Class: Babies or lower division infants . . .

Preliminary step

Let the children show the right and left hands alternately till they can readily distinguish them and practice them in closing all the fingers, except the thumb and forefinger of each hand.

1. Show the children how to take up the needle with the left thumb and forefinger; the eye of the needle upwards and straight in front.
2. Raise the right hand, take up the cotton near the end with the thumb and forefinger. Repeat this several times.
3. Place needle and cotton in position. Bring the cotton in front of the eye of the needle and close up.

4. Show children how to push cotton through the eye while teacher counts to four and tells them this is called threading the needle.
5. Put out three fingers of the left hand and catch the long end of the cotton to prevent it from slipping.
6. With the right thumb and forefinger draw the cotton through the eye . . . The drill should be repeated until the children can thread the needle while the teacher counts to six . . .

Conclusion . . . The object of this is to teach obedience, discipline and simultaneous action.

When I first heard Sir Alec read the syllabus above, I took great satisfaction in thinking how quaint, how silly it all was. This sense of superiority, however, has dwindled. Now I wonder whether the educational theory of my day will seem to my successors seventy years from now to be equally (or more) silly. It is a nice question whether reflection on the past teaches us pride or humility. Perhaps a little of both.

Some advantages in Canadian education

In my sixth year I travelled with my family from Northampton to Liverpool by train, by immigrant liner to Montreal, by train to Red Deer, Alberta, and by ox team for several days to the family homestead near Rocky Mountain House.

We made this journey because my father read an advertisement placed in the local newspaper by the Canadian Pacific Railroad. It announced that settlers could go to Western Canada and become land-owners. LAND! – many goodly acres of it, absolutely free to anyone who would live on it.

Most of our long and varied journey is only a blur among fragmented memories. One scene, however, returns quite clearly. My mother and I ride on the seat of a large box-wagon. She is driving a yoke of oxen as they draw the wagon deeper into a forest. My father and my uncle, axes in hand, walk ahead of us, felling the trees to right and left as we advance. There is no road and no sound except the axe blows and the crashing of the trees. When we reach an open glade, the men say, "This is it!" The branches are lopped from the larger trees along our route of entry. The logs are dragged by the oxen to the glade. Notched and fitted, they form a cabin while my mother and I fill the chinks with a mix of mud and moss. We are five miles from the nearest neighbor, eight miles from the country store, fifty from the nearest doctor. In that setting for about a year my mother was also my teacher. The intense cold, the loneliness, and poor health finally drove the family back to the nearest town, Red Deer.

Eight years later, when I was about 14, my family moved to California. We travelled there by train with stopovers to see Calgary, Seattle, Portland, the (then) world-famous Lithia Springs at Ashland, Oregon, the Pan-Pacific International Fair at San Francisco, and finally Los Angeles. My most vivid recollection of all this movement is how I longed to take a meal in the dining car instead of eating sandwiches which my necessarily frugal mother made for us at each overnight stop. My conclusion is that travel during childhood and early youth is highly educational but in ways and towards results which are not predictable or uniform.

Before we left Red Deer for Los Angeles, I spent the 1914-15 term in the local high school. Two events there proved, I believe, of some importance to my education. The first event was my introduction to organized inter-school debating. Under the rules then in force, our Red Deer debating team was required to include four members—one from each of the four school classes. I was fortunate enough to be selected to represent the Freshman Class. The topic for debate in the Alberta high schools that year was: "*Resolved,* that a system of consolidated rural schools would improve educational opportunity in this Province." I can no longer remember which side I took, for our coach wisely required us to learn both the negative and the affirmative arguments. I do remember that I began to notice the extraordinary difficulty of proof in such a question as compared with the unassailable finality of the theorems of Geometry—another subject to which I was introduced in my Freshman year. I learned also that it is possible to make a statement in a manner which is persuasive, or to present the same proposition in a manner which arouses doubt or disbelief. And I learned from my father that when I rose to speak for my allotted ten minutes, I should break that panic-stricken, nerve-racking, expectant silence that follows when one is called upon to speak by sliding my chair back noisily as I arose and by purposefully rearranging objects at the lectern. One sees the same technique used nowadays, perhaps unconsciously, by speakers who

15

adjust the microphone a few millimeters up or down while the audience settles itself to listen.

The second event of that one term in a Canadian high school was Miss Goudy, a teacher of English who first and finally made me aware of the anatomy of an English sentence and the topography of an English paragraph. Miss Goudy was a teacher who, I feel in retrospect, probably loved the learner as much as the language but who did not temper the rigors of her instruction by soft pedagogy. My youthful recollections of Miss Goudy suggest that she was about 108 years old at the time I sat in her class so I suppose that she no longer teaches English at the Red Deer High School. However, I feel sure that if she is not in Red Deer, Miss Goudy, behind the gold bar of Heaven, is busily teaching wayward cherubim the difference between the subjunctive and indicative mode and the correct usage of the auxiliary verbs "shall" and "will." I make this confident statement about her because we are promised *happiness* in Heaven and I do not think Miss Goudy could feel completely happy doing anything else under the sun.

Walking and working

I entered Manual Arts High School in Los Angeles in mid-term of 1916 and graduated four years later. I did well in my studies and was the valedictorian at the graduation exercises, using as my topic on that occasion, "Teachers'Salaries are a National Disgrace." It may seem disingenuous, especially in view of my later career, to say that my teachers surprised me by their intense interest in the topic I had selected and their willingness to help me develop it.

During all of my years at Manual Arts, I continued to be active in debating and tried repeatedly, but unsuccessfully, to get a place on the track team for distance events.

During my entire high school and college period, our family struggled with serious economic difficulties–never experiencing actual want but always required to seek every possible bit of added income and to avoid every non-essential expenditure. It was taken for granted by all of us that it would be necessary for me to work as much as possible to supplement the family income. So from the age of about sixteen onward, I worked on Saturdays, before school, and after school at whatever I could find for whatever I could earn. My work was unskilled, poorly paid, repetitive and often boring. I picked apricots, cleaned out chicken houses, swept and dusted the high school auditorium and certain classrooms from six to eight every morning, swept the school cafeteria every evening, worked in the Sunset Candy Factory in the longer vacations, ran errands, delivered newspapers, ushered at a race track and at the opera house, worked as a bellhop in a small hotel, and ran the hotel elevator on the night shift. I liked especially the last of these occupations because, between the infrequent calls for service, I could continue to feed my voracious appetite for reading.

All of these work experiences were, of course, highly educational. It never occurred to me that the work was "menial." I did not resent it. I just took it for granted. I felt, when I thought about the matter at all, that I was lucky to have the work. In retrospect, I still think so.

Although it would never have occurred to me at the time, Manual Arts High School served an area in Los Angeles inhabited generally by lower-middle-class or upper-lower-class people. Yet the school contained a few students who have since become famous: Frank Capra, motion picture director; Sterling McMurrin, United States Commissioner of Education; Lawrence Tibbett, Metropolitan Opera baritone; State Attorney-General Buren Fitts; half a dozen well-known judges; several generals including Jimmy Doolittle; and a number of highly successful athletes, actors, and actresses. Frank Capra, in fact, was my predecessor in the morning janitor job described above.

On Sundays, during much of my time at Manual Arts, I had a very different kind of experience. I used to rise before dawn, meet another boy in the Pacific Electric Station at Sixth and Main, take the first train to Pasadena, and arrive at the foothills of the Sierra Madre in the early daylight. Then we walked the trail to the summit of Mount Lowe, ate our sandwiches, ran back over the same route, and reached home in time for supper. After a dozen or so ascents, we began to run *up* the mountain as well as down. We rarely paused to admire the view, we exchanged very few remarks, we met few other hikers. We were not secretive about our outing but we did not discuss it. We just went.

Mount Lowe is about a mile high. I no longer remember how or why we began to climb it every Sunday. We certainly did not know why we continued week after week for several years. Although our achievement was not as great as that of Sir Edmund Hilary, perhaps our motive was similar. Whatever the motive, there were, for me at least, three results of this rather bizarre exercise.

17

First, I built up a very serviceable bodily constitution which has served me well.

Second, it was good for my self-esteem. Just after the Armistice of World War I, the *Los Angeles Examiner* sponsored a "Victory Hike." The course was about ten miles from the *Examiner's* downtown office to Griffith Park. I entered the contest, was the first high school student across the finish line and second among all entries—adult or student. I was handed a silver cup on the spot and then—since public transport was difficult because of the crowd that had assembled to see the finish—I put the cup under one arm and cheerfully walked home—another ten or twelve miles.

That might well have been the end of a mildly pleasant episode but the Principal of Manual Arts High School had other plans. He decided that the cup should be handed to me publicly during a school assembly. I did not understand then why this ceremony was so "gratifying" to me. But I think I know why, now. I wanted the other students in the school to stop thinking of me, if only for a few minutes, as someone who often received "A" grades and did well on the debating team. I wanted them to know that I could do something that required a degree of physical stamina, and muscular coordination. It is, I now believe, extremely desirable that every teenage boy *win* at least *one* contest, involving skill and endurance. I now suspect that Dr. Wilson called me to the stage with that thought in mind. At any rate, I no longer felt obliged to struggle in vain for a place on the track team. That was a clear gain for everyone because the truth is that I could not run very fast. It just happened that the slopes of Mount Lowe conditioned me to be able to keep going a very long time without tiring.

A third result of the weekly journey up Mount Lowe was more intellectual. There was a small abandoned gold mine about halfway up the slope. There and elsewhere along the trail we used to pick up ore samples. Of course, we wanted to be assured that the iron pyrites were really gold flecks and from that we became interested generally in the identification of minerals. We found and used Dana's *System of Mineralogy* but some of the tests in that great compendium required the equipment of a chemistry laboratory. Since we were both enrolled in Miss Calhoun's class in Chemistry, we took the problem to her. That good and conscientious teacher immediately gave us so much attention and so much opportunity to experiment that we both decided at once to become mining engineers.

This was vocational guidance in 1920, building plans for a career requiring arduous and long preparation on the basis of a youthful and, as it turned out, a passing enthusiasm. I wonder whether such guidance practices continue today.

Incidentally, my hiking partner, the other boy in this experience, did become a successful mining engineer so Miss Calhoun's devoted interest was fifty percent successful, and, in the long run, it did me no harm whatever.

Advantages of working in a college library

In September 1920 I enrolled as a Freshman in mining engineering at the Southern Branch of the University of California, later and now called UCLA. In the opening week of school I had the good fortune to get a job in the institution's library. My work there was varied but unskilled–painting numbers on the backs of books, restoring books to their proper places on the shelves, moving collections to and from the Reserved Book Room, and checking borrowed books out and in.

However, one cannot handle books several hours a day without learning something about their contents and I soon acquired a fair knowledge of the Dewey Decimal Classification System and of the standard works of reference.

Such information has been, and remains, a set of tools of frequent utility to me.

Since I had to earn money to stay at the University, even though I continued to live with my parents, the library work, or some other source of earnings, was essential.

My employment in the Southern Branch of the University of California library led me to further good fortune–I met Elizabeth Vaughan there. She too was a first-year student library assistant who, however, outranked me in the library hierarchy because she had had some previous formal library training and work experience. We were married four years later, after I graduated. This was my greatest stroke of good fortune, not merely as an outgrowth of my library job but also as an indispensable aspect of the rest of my personal life and professional career. My advice to all young men entering college, based on my own experience, is: Get a job in the library, find the prettiest librarian working there, and marry her as soon as you graduate or as soon as she is willing, whichever comes first.

Academic catastrophes and goal adjustments

My career as a student of mining engineering was not a comparable unmixed success. I did well enough, for example, on the theory of the Calculus but I was far from brilliant in problems which involved practical applications of its principles. I could understand the theory of the slide rule, but when I used the tool I often reached a wrong answer because I set the rule inaccurately or read from the wrong scale. I could, after careful study, understand Spherical Trigonometry, but my answers to assigned problems were often wrong because I let arithmetical errors creep into the involved calculations. I fully enjoyed the introductory course in surveying but when the class was sent out for field work, my team often wound up in last place because I shook the transit at a critical moment or failed to make the proper note of some essential measurement. Such academic catastrophes continued for almost two years.

My most dramatic reverses came in the laboratory section of a course in Quantitative Chemical Analysis. My crucible broke just before the critical moment when the ashes were to be weighed. My beaker boiled dry while my attention was momentarily diverted. Clumsy handling of the relatively simple apparatus brought other forms of disaster. We were required to keep laboratory notebooks which must be submitted as a condition of completing the course. I lost my notebook just before the course ended. This was the final straw.

I was unable to understand why my mediocre record in mathematics and science should follow a high school record of exceptional achievement. The evening after I lost my "lab" notebook, Elizabeth and I had a serious conversation, neither our first nor our last, but one of our most important. One alternative we never seriously considered was to drop out of college altogether. We did think about modifications in objectives. The upshot was the radical decision to leave mining engineering to others and to embark in my third year of college on a liberal arts program. My vocational objective in mining engineering had been entirely clear; where the liberal arts program would lead, if anywhere, was obscure. But I changed direction anyway.

Changing courses in mid-stream

My chief, indeed for all practical purposes, my only, faculty contact at that time was Dr. Herbert Allen of the English Depart-

20

ment. The others lectured me, enlightened me, assigned my lessons, tested me at intervals, graded me, and (very occasionally) spoke or nodded if our paths crossed on campus. Dr. Allen, however, took seriously his role as the faculty advisor for my fraternity. Very pleased when informed of my change in plans, he threw himself into the solution of my problem of how to get a degree in four years in spite of the mid-stream shift in courses. He outlined for me an excellent program in history, philosophy, logic and literature and he urged me to take my degree at Stanford. It was, in fact, impossible in those days to qualify for a baccalaureate at the Los Angeles "branch" because only three years of regular course work were offered there.

Under the new program, my academic standing and my own sense of achievement were both improved although I had to take on an exceptionally heavy load in order to make up for the liberal arts courses that I had missed.

The move to Stanford in September 1923 appears in retrospect to have been an immense decision. At the time, I was rather nonchalant about it. However, I had to live away from home for the first time in my life, move to a strange town, adjust to a new campus, and find employment on a larger scale than before in order to pay the new expenses of tuition, room, and board. The employment was absolutely essential, for I had no help, nor any thought of expecting help, from anyone but myself. Fortunate as always, I secured a job at once in the Stanford Library. I also found a furnished room with meals which I paid for by building the morning fires, washing the evening dishes, and scrubbing the kitchen on Saturdays.

I had decided that the most available vocational objective for a liberal arts graduate would be teaching, so my year at Stanford had to be planned to include the courses required by the State of California for a teacher's credential.

One professor at Stanford stands out in the memory of my undergraduate year there. I had many teachers who were brilliant, eloquent, inspiring, amusing. But John C. Almack of the Department of Education, like Dr. Allen at S.B.U.C., was interested *in me*. How he showed that personal interest I cannot exactly say, but I was (and remain) certain that it existed. One day, for example, he invited me to his home for a Sunday afternoon tea. That casual invitation meant more to me as an undergraduate than an honorary doctorate did thirty years later. Dr. Almack was not a great

21

scholar, not even an especially powerful teacher. He did have the habit of caring about students and their intellectual growth and the discretion, too, to allow the student to see that he cared. He occasionally asked my opinion. He *listened* when I gave it. He made it quite clear that he had complete and unqualified confidence in me to accomplish anything at all. And I responded with my utmost effort.

I have introduced Dr. Almack at this point and in this way because he once made a remark to me that exerted a far-reaching effect on me and my career. He asked me whether I had heard of the Rafael Herman Prize. I answered that I had not and he replied casually that I might well look it up.

Rafael Herman, I found, was a Detroit merchant who in 1923 offered a prize of $25,000 for the best essay on how education could contribute to international understanding and peace. Dr. Almack made it clear that he had every confidence that I could win that prize. I was already carrying about thirty percent more than the standard academic load, working for pay about thirty hours a week, literally running from class to job and chewing my home-made luncheon sandwich as I ran. I had no time at all for anything else. But Dr. Almack thought I should enter that contest. So, of course, I did. The results of that encouragement, spur, enticement–call it what you will–have profoundly affected my career.

This is not the place to tell how the contest turned out. I withhold the information in order to keep my reader alert. Everything shall be revealed in due sequence.

Here it is necessary only to relate that in June 1924, I received my A.B. degree along with a document entitling me to teach mathematics, English, and French in California junior high schools. In August, Elizabeth Vaughan and I were married and in September I began teaching in Roosevelt School in Glendale, California.

Influences and consequences

The end of my undergraduate education is a suitable point to make a few general observations about my earlier years.

I have sometimes been asked, for example, what role my family background played in the years of my youth. I do not think that my own immediate family played a major direct role in my early professional career. Had my parents been indifferent or hostile to education or to intellectual development, they might well have exerted an adverse effect on me. Fortunately this was by no means the case. The best gift my parents offered for my development was the good example of an industrious, unselfish life. Fortunately, too, my parents were not excessively ambitious for me. They exerted no pressure that I can remember. They did not urge me to continue my formal education. They took it for granted that I would do well in school, were genuinely pleased if I did so, and were not afraid to show their pride and happiness on such occasions. Academic success, however, was not a major objective of our family life.

My role in the family was a relatively independent one. I had a reasonable load of responsibility with regard to household chores. I was expected to look after my younger brother while he was small. I was expected, but not required, to contribute as I could to the family budget. Yet, I do not recall that these responsibilities ever seemed to me to be unreasonable.

It appears from my recent observations and reading that many—perhaps most—young people these days are affected and deeply troubled by something called an "identity crisis." I have asked myself, not without some misgivings, what kind of identity crisis I suffered—and why. I have asked myself: What was my "self-image," was I troubled about my "life-style," what was the nature of the "generation gap" between me and my parents and other older people? I feel slightly embarrassed and inadequate to respond that I was not aware of any such problems in my youth.

If such problems were indeed present I lack the sharpness of introspection and the vividness of memory to describe them. I simply have no recollection of being troubled by such questions during my childhood and youth. And if any of my young friends and contemporaries suffered from such troubles they gave no outward sign of them and did not share them with me.

I do not mean to imply that the present widely reported youthful self-examinations are not real and painful. I only congratulate myself that I, along with (I believe) most of my generation, was spared these agonizing experiences.

A somewhat related question that is sometimes put to me is that of the bearing of religion upon my early life. The completely honest answer is: none whatever, so far as I can tell or so far as any usual definition of religion is concerned.

Nor, looking back on the panorama of the different kinds of communities in which I spent my first twenty-five years, can I perceive any really striking effects of the environment on my own life or ways of thinking. Of course, the fact that I cannot see them does not prove that they do not exist. An English factory town, a homestead in the wild forest of Alberta, a small farm market town, a rapidly growing Western metropolis, a university town—none of these had any relation that I can discern or describe to the events of my later life. Of course, had I lived in other places my life would probably have been different, but in what ways or for what reasons it is impossible for me to guess.

Later on, when we lived in Washington, we encountered another environment which did affect my career and which will be described when we come to it.

2 Teaching and Graduate Study

Was I prepared to teach?–The influence of a great principal–Road to Utopia–Poor but happy–Looking for work–Trying to act my age–Stanford revisited again–Memory on "Memory"–In search of John Swett–Ellwood Patterson Cubberley–David Starr Jordan.

My teaching experience in Glendale was pleasant but strenuous. Since I was the newest man on the faculty, of course I was given the "Z" group for my homeroom and for most of my classes each day. I was also allowed, by common consent, the privilege of spending my lunch hour in playground supervision. Each afternoon, for fifteen dollars a month extra, I stayed after school two hours to supervise the playground and to put away the equipment about five o'clock.

Lest someone conclude that I was dissatisfied with my position as a teacher under these conditions, I hasten to correct any such impression. The "dumb bunnies," as my "Z" homeroom children called themselves–cheerfully, unselfconsciously, and accurately–gave me no serious trouble. It was the intellectually gifted youngsters who kept me on edge. The "Z's" were lethargic, undemanding, polite, and appreciative. As for the playground, I enjoyed being out of doors in the California sunshine, which in those halcyon days came to us without the present interposition of a blanket of smog. Furthermore, I had always enjoyed games of any kind, either as a participant or spectator, so I felt no resentment at all upon being "invited" to assume the noon-time duties on the playground.

Was I prepared to teach?

Looking backward as objectively as I can, and comparing the requirements of that first year of teaching with the training provided at Stanford, I must say that the training appeared then, and still does, to have been of minor vocational value. A college education had made me, I assume, more articulate, more sensitive to ideas, and more accustomed to rational processes. If so, these were very important advantages for the enrichment of my life in any sort of work. However, as far as specific pedagogical skills are concerned, my training contributed very little. The course in Practice Teaching no doubt made the first plunge into a classroom "on my own" a little less difficult. The required course on California School Law helped me to keep an attendance record in the precise form required by law to receive state reimbursement to the Glendale School District. Courses in the History and Philosophy of Education had given me some impression about the nature and background of the vast social institution of schooling in which I now formed a tiny part. But for day-to-day help in understanding my students and in teaching them, I can recall no substantial advantage from my training.

Before I began to teach at Glendale it was necessary for me to see the County Superintendent of Schools in order that my state certificate could be validated as a Los Angeles County credential. Mark Keppel, then Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools, was a large and legendary figure. He tried to meet every new teacher in the county. And each interview, though brief, was emphatic. The most important point he made in his talk with me, and I suppose with all others, was the absolute rule against smoking by teachers or pupils in the Los Angeles County Schools. This was not a question of smoking while on school property or while on duty; the ban was effective under all circumstances, every hour and every day. This was no particular hardship for me but I used to hear many complaints from others. Nowadays, when it is clear that substantial ill effects on health may be produced by the smoking of cigarettes, Mr. Keppel's ironclad ban may appear to be a more benign, if no less arbitrary, directive.

Mr. Keppel was also well-known as the author or sponsor of practically all California school legislation enacted during the first quarter of the Twentieth Century. He was President of the California Teachers Association and its unchallenged spokesman on legislative policies. Much of the California system of school finance is derived from his devotion and sagacity.

The influence of a great principal

The principal of my school was Norman Whitock. I was fortunate to have been placed with him. He was not an office principal–he was all over the school and its grounds all the time. Yet he never entered a classroom without telling the teacher in advance that he was planning to visit. Everything he said was positive, helpful, appreciative, and appreciated. He had the unusual capacity of being able to listen as well as to hear. Mr. Whitock first introduced me to the idea of professional associations. I belonged to none at the time, but he invited me to accompany him to teachers meetings in parts of Los Angeles County at which the scheduled speaker or topic would, in his opinion, be helpful to me. On the way to the meeting he would tell me what we might hear. We would then listen at the meeting, and on the way back we would review its significance. It is intended as no reflection on Stanford University to say that I received more direct help from Mr. Whitock in one year than I did from all my undergraduate courses in education.

I doubt that this mutual respect between teacher and principal exists today as it did then. If it has indeed been irrecoverably lost, that is a great pity. Both teachers and principals who fail to maintain this relationship are losing a great deal. More important, the quality of education is impoverished.

As already mentioned, I made a little extra money by supervising the school playground after school hours, but this was not the full extent of my moonlighting. I worked almost every evening at the UCLA library on the small campus on North Vermont Avenue. Although I had no formal library training, I was placed in charge of the library during the evening hours. My work there allowed me a good deal of time for reading on my own.

In my actual teaching I found that my students did not behave according to the neat stimulus-response formula that had been explained to me in courses in educational psychology. Some of the bright students knew the answers before I could either finish the question or find the answer in the textbook for myself. Others showed a disheartening resistance to learning. Furthermore, I soon found that I had no average students in my class and that probably there were none in the school. All the students seemed to be deviates in one way or another from a central tendency which no one of them embodied.

Road to Utopia

With Mr. Whitock's encouragement, I enrolled in an evening extension course in order that I might become a better teacher and incidentally qualify for promotion or a higher salary. That course, taught by Dr. J. Harold Williams, dealt with educational tests and measurements. It opened for me a magic casement on the perilous seas of normal curve, standard deviation, objectivity, reliability, validity and many other new concepts.

It is not easy to communicate on paper and at a distance of some fifty years the excitement and challenge that such experiences could bring in those days. Instruction in tests and measurements is now (I suppose) a routine item in the preparation of teachers. In 1924, however, educational research was for many of us a brave new world, a mystery into which only we happy few could be initiated, and a shining hope for the correction of past mistakes and present errors in teaching. The essential process was, it seemed, simplicity itself. First, one must make a careful study of the society to determine what children needed to learn. Second, we must study the children in order to determine what they could learn and how fast they could learn it. Third, we must list the various ways of organizing and presenting the material to be learned. Finally, we were to discover by careful experiment, eliminating one variable at a time, which of all possible ways to teach was the most efficient.

When these tasks were done, schools would be perfect, requiring nothing but a little administrative oiling and adjusting from that time forward to eternity. I felt sorry for all the previous generations of teachers who had not glimpsed the promised land or set foot on the broad avenue which would surely lead the teaching profession to the pedagogical Utopia. It was thrilling to be alive in an era destined to fashion the keys which would unlock the door to unlimited educational progress.

Dr. Williams, sensing my enthusiasm for the possibilities in this field, arranged to have me admitted on Saturday mornings to the Los Angeles Child Guidance Clinic—not as a client, I must insist, but as an observer. Glowing with the vision of educational improvement, I went to the Clinic at every opportunity, haunted the consultation rooms, prowled through the library, read the fascinating case records of various psychic and other disorders. I sat behind a screen watching the psychologists and their patients with rapt attention. If I live to be a hundred I shall not forget the thrill when I first saw a technically flawless administration of an individual Stanford-Binet test.

After such experiences, I could hardly wait to get hold of the testing materials myself. I made myself a set of five weights. I fashioned my own Healy-Fernald form-board. Thus equipped, I would, at the least excuse, test anyone who came within reach, including my students and my friends. Let any child show any signs of misbehavior in my classroom and he would face me after school, while, with pencil, notebook, and stopwatch in hand, I solemnly intoned:

"There are three main differences between a president and a king. What are they?"

"Listen carefully. I am going to read some numbers and I want you to say them backwards."

I was eager to give the Stanford-Binet to anyone who would stay with me long enough. I yearned to administer it to the other teachers, but met what I considered to be a non-professional and reactionary lack of interest on the part of my colleagues, which denied me the pleasure and deprived them of any possible benefit.

Thus I came to realize that it would take a little time to make education completely scientific. But, being young, I was willing to wait and to work. I concluded that it might require as much as four or five years before the new science could be perfected and applied. Furthermore, I had some doubts about applying the research methods to those parts of education which aimed at such goals as character development and artistic appreciation. Although, even in these areas, the construction of tests was going forward with remorseless energy, I soon became convinced that it would take even longer than five years before the conquest of ugliness and evil-doing would follow the conquest of ignorance. I remained sure of the dicta attributed to Edward L. Thorndike and William McCall that "Whatever exists at all exists in some amount" and that "anything that exists in some amount can be measured." Furthermore, I felt, as did many others at that time, that if some educational outcomes might escape the micrometer and the kymograph, such annoying, imponderable elements could not be very important anyway.

Looking back on those days I still think we were not wrong to respect the power of systematic inquiry to develop solutions to educational problems. We forgot (or more accurately, we failed to anticipate) the discouraging detours, the twists of the highway, the bumps, the unpaved links, and the stop-and-go lights of public opinion. In our unguarded enthusiasm we ignored many grave difficulties which a more realistic and prudent but still (I hope) persistent policy today will take into account.

During the last few months of my first year in teaching, it became necessary to decide whether to remain in Glendale for another year or to move to Stanford so that I could seek a master's degree. This was not an easy decision. I was by no means discontented or unhappy with teaching. My wife had continued to work at the University library, and although we had saved as much money as we could from our salaries, there was real doubt whether we could afford a year at Stanford. Certainly if we did go to Stanford it would be necessary to get additional employment in that area if I wanted to continue to study and learn. On the other hand, the road to substantial further training through Saturday and evening classes did appear long and uncertain. My wife, who might have been expected to favor remaining in Glendale, near all her friends and her family and my family, was all for moving so that I might obtain further education. So, after many anxious discussions of ways and means, I declined the Glendale contract for 1925-26.

Poor but happy

In September 1925 we moved to Palo Alto, where I enrolled in Stanford University for a Master of Arts degree. By strict economy and by signing up for all of the extra work anyone would give me, we managed to pay the bills and the tuition.

The first graduate year at Stanford was academically uneventful. It was, in spite of hard work and Spartan living, a happy year. Remembering both my mathematics training (during the days when mining engineering was my goal) and my continuing French studies, Dr. Almack displayed his customary supreme confidence in his students by introducing me to D'Ocagne's writings on the Nomograph. Later on I prepared and published my first professional article, discussing the possible application of the Nomograph to the solution of problems in educational research.

My dissertation for the Master of Arts degree was entitled "Desirable Qualities in a Textbook," including the history of the teaching of English in the United States as revealed by a study of the English textbooks used in the past. My wife was typing page 89 of this dissertation when she made an announcement which sent me hurrying according to plan to borrow a neighbor's car to drive her to the ambulance entrance at Palo Alto Hospital. Our son was born there on April 11, 1926. I was so pleased with this event that I even finished typing the dissertation myself. My degree was awarded in June. My parents and my wife were on hand to see me hooded; it was in fact the only one of my three Stanford degrees which I had time to accept at first hand. The others were mailed to me.

Looking for work

As the year drew to a close we had to face the question as to whether I should remain at Stanford for still further graduate work or take a teaching position. Rather reluctantly we chose the second alternative for the compelling reason that there was not enough money to pay tuition for another semester. Accordingly, I let the academic world know that I wished to be employed.

Soon after my availability was made known, I accepted a proposal from the Washington State College at Cheney, located just outside Spokane, to be either a professor of English or a professor of Education–I forget which. It really did not matter, however, because the Governor of Washington, just a few days after I signed the contract, vetoed an appropriation bill which so reduced the funds available to all the state institutions of higher education that Cheney could no longer keep its part of the bargain. I am sure that there was no personal malice towards me in the Governor's action and I forgave him almost at once. I am happy to be able to add, however, that I cannot remember his name.

By the time the Cheney matter was finally settled it was rather late in the academic year. Most employment opportunities had already been filled. However, an acquaintance, another graduate student at Stanford, after being interviewed and screened, had accepted employment at Pacific University in Forest Grove, Oregon, as a Professor of Education. After he had signed his contract with Pacific, he received a belated invitation to return to a position near his home in Minnesota. Wishing to accept this new invitation, he asked me if I would take the post at Pacific University as his substitute. I agreed, but I was more than a little surprised when he telegraphed me from Forest Grove that Pacific University had appointed me as Professor of Education. I had never been interviewed. All the President of the University had were my papers and the word of my friend who obviously wanted me in the job so that he could go elsewhere with a clear conscience.

In the summer of 1926 I did not undertake much work for pay but I kept busy nevertheless. In my work in library reference rooms I had noticed that while there were dictionaries of music, of art, and of almost every other field, there was no Dictionary of Education. It occured to me that I ought to bestir myself to fill this gap. I had been reading Boswell's "Life of Johnson" so that it did not seem impossible for me to write singlehandedly the first dictionary of educational terminology. After working on this idea during most of the summer, I proudly offered the completed manuscript to a publisher who quickly returned it to me with thanks and regrets.

Disappointed but not discouraged, I turned at once to another kind of scholarly enterprise. I had at Stanford a good deal of work in Middle English and a particularly good course on Chaucer. It appeared to me a pity that most of the works of Chaucer, other than the "Canterbury Tales," were unavailable to modern readers because of the lack of a translation to modern English. I therefore set out to translate a number of Chaucer's lesser poems, including the "Parliament of Birds" and several of the ballads and roundels. In this work I endeavored not only to convey Chaucer's meaning, but also to imitate as closely as I could, the complex meter and rhyme scheme of the original verse. Some of these poems were subsequently published. In fact, I received my first check for writing anything from a magazine called "The Golden Book" for a translation of Chaucer's "To Rosemounde." The amount, as I recall it, was $25.00. I should have framed that check, but I cashed it and spent it.

When autumn approached it was time for Pacific University to open. I bought a second-hand, Model T Ford to drive from Bellflower, near Los Angeles, where we had been staying with my wife's parents, to Forest Grove, Oregon. I doubt if any other automobile, except perhaps some of the vehicles described in "The Grapes of Wrath," has ever been more heavily and strangely laden.

We carried our bedding and blankets so that we could rent the cheaper unfurnished cabins along the way. We carried large amounts of food, a folding crib and a tin bathtub for the baby, tools to repair the car, and a large box of books. All of this gear was strapped to a special arrangement on one of the running boards or stowed in the back seat. The journey took us about a week, a leisurely practice which my wife urged and which we have since followed quite generally. We have always tried not to go anywhere without seeing as much as possible along the way. Thus, for example, we coaxed that trembling heavy-laden Model T up to Crater Lake National Park and to many other spots of beauty and historical interest along the way.

Trying to act my age

I was concerned all the summer of 1926 about the possibility that my youthful appearance (I was 25) might deny me such respect from the students as would be due a Professor of Education. It occurred to me that I might look older if I had a moustache and I allowed it to grow for about a month before arriving in Forest Grove. Once arrived, I hurried to the college and told the receptionist in the office that I wanted to see President Dobbs. He was momentarily away from his desk but would soon return. President Dobbs had never before seen me. He perceived me waiting in his reception room, came to me at once in his hearty manner, patted me on the shoulder, and said, "Young man, you are most welcome to Pacific University. Come with me and I will show you to the freshman dormitory." I hastily explained that I was his new Professor of Education. That evening I gave up trying to look older than I was, shaved off my moustache, and have not tried to grow one since. Times do change; if I understand matters rightly, one wears moustache or beard nowadays to demonstrate how *young* one is.

At Pacific University we settled rather quickly into the pleasant life of a small college town. The title of Professor of Education by no means covered all of my responsibilities. I was not merely a Professor of Education; I was *the* Professor of Education. Therefore I was *ex-officio* Head of the Department and Director of Practice Teaching. I was also responsible for the placement of those graduates of Pacific University who wanted to teach–and about 90 percent of them did. I was also in charge of the Fresh-men Orientation Program and gave most of the lectures on "How to Study." Furthermore, at faculty meetings when I ventured some observation about the improvement of the existing situation, I found myself immediately the chairman of a committee to consider the matter. Just to make sure that I had no unnecessary spare time on my hands, I decided that some teachers in the neighborhood might wish to secure further training, so I began an evening class for them.

Before we left Stanford I had found out that I did not win the Rafael Herman Prize for the best plan for teaching international peace and understanding in the schools. I found out something else about that contest about 20 years later, of which more later. The Prize was in fact awarded to the Chancellor of Stanford University, the distinguished and learned David Starr Jordan. Thereupon, my constant stimulator and friend, Dr. Almack, suggested that the reading and writing I had done to enter the contest should now be turned into a book. I filled in the chinks of time during my stay in Forest Grove, knocking out one chapter after another of a manuscript entitled, "Education for World Citizenship." As I look back on this particular effort, I am more than usually astounded by my own temerity. Even by the relatively loose standards of that day, I was not qualified. I was writing on a subject which, as far as I knew, no one else had ever touched. I had no library of any consequence to turn to, nor any colleagues with whom I could discuss the book.

Life in Forest Grove was pleasant. Although I had a full academic load and was writing a book, I still had considerable free time as compared to the hectic student years. As the academic year drew to a close, the President of the University asked me to remain. The choice was between remaining at Pacific University under relatively easy conditions with an assured, if small, income, insulated from turmoil, *or* returning to Stanford to carry two more years of combined graduate work and gainful employment with all the pressures these involved. After many hours of anxious thought and discussion, I decided to telephone Dr. Cubberley, the Dean of the School of Education at Stanford.

In our little town a long distance telephone call was a major event. The telephone instrument itself hung on the wall at a height of about six feet and was operated with a crank which, on being turned a certain number of times, produced a code which summoned the attention of the operator, if the operator was at the switchboard just then. Once the connection was established, I explained to Dr. Cubberley as best I could, the nature of my dilemma. He unequivocally and instantly urged me to return to Stanford and said that if I would come back he would see that I received the highly-coveted Cubberley Scholarship. This Award, personally financed (as I later found) by Dr. Cubberley himself, paid an annual amount of $600, a very attractive sum in those days. In return for the scholarship I would assist the Dean in his teaching responsibilities, take over the class according to his directions if he had to be away, and substitute on request for any other professor who happened to be unable to meet his classes.

That did it. We began to pack for the south-bound return trip, but in accordance with our now well-established policy, we first drove north to Seattle and took the ferry to see Vancouver Island. It was a beautiful spring, the roadsides were gay with wild flowers, and in the northern parts of Washington, the yellow gorse edged every country road with gold.

The National Education Association met in Seattle that summer. I read about the coming meeting in the newspapers. I had no idea at all that it would be possible for me to attend, and no thought that I might, if I wished, become a member of the Association. During my graduate and undergraduate training I had often used the publications of the NEA. I thought the Association must be a group of elder statesmen in education. I assumed that if I did well and behaved myself I might perhaps at the age of fifty or so be elected to membership. It was thirty-seven years later that I attended my first Seattle Convention of the NEA.

Stanford revisited again

Back to Stanford for the third time in September 1929, this time to begin a two-year program for the doctorate.

My friend, Dr. Almack, once again used his unlimited confidence in me to suggest that I apply for a position on the staff of the California Teachers Association. This was a half-time job, calling for approximately four hours per day in the CTA office in San Francisco. The train and streetcar rides amounted to about one hour each way. By careful planning of classes, I was able to put together a workable schedule.

Accordingly, I applied and was appointed. The man who preceded me as director of research for the CTA had been employed on a full-time basis. It was never made clear to me how the work which an experienced man required a full day to accomplish, could be handled by a novice in half the time. Nevertheless, that seemed to be the expectation. Upon reporting to Roy Cloud, then the executive secretary of the California Teachers Association, I was asked if I had training in educational research. I responded in the affirmative. Mr. Cloud then showed me a report published by the California Taxpayers Association which was highly critical of the expenditures of the Fresno County schools. "This report," said Mr. Cloud, "is full of prejudicial statements. Your first job is to locate every error and expose the report thoroughly. If you need to visit Fresno to examine the original data, you may do so. We need your report in about two weeks." I did find a good deal to criticize in the report of the California Taxpayers Association. The errors were based on incorrect inferences and, to a lesser extent, on faulty data.

After careful work, I wrote my report, filled it with as many footnotes and polysyllables as possible, and handed it to Mr. Cloud, who in turn referred it to Vaughan MacCaughey, editor of publications for the CTA. Next to Miss Goudy in Canada, Mr. MacCaughey was my most effective teacher of written English. He had absolutely no feeling for the artistic, and no use for the poetic in English composition, but he had an implacable determination to make prose clear and concise. His life-long desire was to edit a teachers' magazine which would cause every reader to gasp with astonishment at every new page. Teachers' journals do not lend themselves easily to this kind of treatment.

Instead of being a handicap, I found that the nearly two hours every day on the train and streetcar could be turned into a substantial asset. In those two hours a day I did most of the reading for my graduate courses. I also learned enough German to pass the Ph.D. examination in that subject. This last event deserves a few paragraphs in itself.

Memory on "Memory"

The requirements for the Ph.D. degree at Stanford included "a reading knowledge" of German and French. I could already read French almost as fluently as I could English. I had not studied German a day in my life. At first I enrolled in the beginner's German class, but I found myself studying tenses, conjugations, and other ferocious aspects of German grammar. I could see that if I proceeded to learn the language in this manner, I might be one hundred years old before I would fulfill that particular requirement for the doctorate. Candidates were required to have "a reading knowledge." We were not required to be able to write German, to speak German, or to understand German when spoken. So why, I asked myself, take time to learn to pronounce it?

I therefore decided to aim straight at the target. I had to be prepared to go to the office of a professor of German and read to him in English from a book in German which he would hand me. It will not surprise university people to be told here that other doctoral candidates before me had undergone the same examination and that their experience was carefully reviewed by those who were to follow them. The professor of German had a number of books but there was one book which, because of its appropriateness to the study of pedagogy, he apparently used invariably to test the reading knowledge of German of Ph.D. candidates from the School of Education. This book was Herman Ebbinghaus' "On Memory." Given this lead, my learning task could be considerably narrowed because there was an English translation of this same book. I borrowed both the German and the English texts from the University library. As I signed my name on the cards to borrow the books, I could see a long list of the names of my predecessors, who had been equally interested in the thoughts of Professor Ebbinghaus, both in German and in English. I carried the two books with me constantly. I developed for myself a definite study procedure. I read from the German text until reaching a passage which I could not understand. Sometimes, if the English translation was not as literal as I wished, it was also necessary to look up German words in the dictionary. I wrote the German word on one side of a small card and the English on the other. At the end of each day I ran through the accumulation of cards, German side up, calling out the English equivalent of each German word. If I could give the English equivalent without looking at the English side of the card, I put that card in one pile; if I had to look at the English side of the card, I put it in another pile. One week later I came back to the first pile and any cards for which I still knew the English equivalent were then thrown away. Any card that I had forgotten was added to the pile which was still to be learned. I played this kind of linguistic solitaire on the train between Palo Alto and San Francisco every day for about three months. At the end of that period, I presented myself before the professor of German, was handed a copy of Ebbinghaus' "On Memory" and proceeded to read from it. Thus the demands for scholarship were satisfied. One of the odd and not particularly attractive things about this procedure, however, is that I have no coherent idea what Professor Dr. Ebbinghaus had to say about Memory—and if I ever knew I have forgotten.

I took as many graduate courses as I could in English literature, particularly Elizabethan literature, and in French literature, as well as the required courses for a graduate degree from the School of Education.

In search of John Swett

After the Cubberley fellowship was renewed for a second year, I had to decide upon the subject for my doctoral dissertation. Because I had enjoyed Dr. Cubberley's courses on the History of Education, I decided that my dissertation would be educational history, preferably the biography of some prominent educator. I found, however, that almost everyone prominent in American education had already been covered in at least one biography. There was a tantalizing exception, a man named John Swett (1830-1913), who is widely regarded as the founder of the California public school system. The difficulty was that I had no source materials other than those which had already been collected and published and my professors were naturally reluctant to approve the topic under such conditions. John Swett himself had written a good autobiography from which I gained an impression that he was the kind of man who would save every memorandum and scrap of paper. One day I happened to meet his son, Frank Swett, who was at that time Secretary of the California Pear Growers Association with an office in San Francisco. I told Frank Swett of my interest in writing his father's biography as a dissertation. I explained the problem caused by the lack of source material. He said that two large trunks that had belonged to his father were still in the attic of the family ranch house near Martinez, California. The following Sunday he drove me out there. We climbed up through the dust of decades and he opened the trunks. Both were crammed with memoranda, letters, newspaper clippings, and other material.

It was a bonanza. I began work, promptly and exuberantly, on the dusty task of classifying the material. Early in 1928 I began to write the dissertation. I really had more material than I needed or could effectively use. Since I disliked to omit anything, the work went slowly. Besides, my regular classwork, together with half-time at the California Teachers Association, plus tutoring, library work, and a few other jobs here and there to pick up extra money, did not give me enough waking hours. I managed to finish all of my course work by December 1928, and thereafter devoted as much time as I could to the dissertation, finally completing it in the summer of 1929.

Ellwood Patterson Cubberley

Before closing the account of student days at Stanford, I want to say a few words about Dean Ellwood Patterson Cubberley. Dr. Cubberley provided the scholarship for two years that helped to make my stay at Stanford for the doctorate financially possible. Several of his ideas formed an important ingredient in the curriculum of the School of Education at Stanford.

Dr. Cubberley always stressed the relation between schools and democratic government. His books on the history of education showed how democratic ideals and free public schools developed side by side. His *Public Education in the United States* has three dramatic chapters showing how the free public school developed from "the distant hope of statesmen and reformers" to "the great constructive tool of civilization." He taught that this development was opposed at every turn by "the aristocratic class," by "politicians of small vision" and by "the ignorant, narrow-minded and penurious." The chapters which described the seven great battles for the establishment of public schools became a part of the thinking of everyone who studied under Dr. Cubberley or read his textbooks. The influence of these ideas on me was probably greater than on other people because I worked directly with him as a teaching fellow.

Dr. Cubberley taught that the school must be changed to meet new social conditions. In a small book called *Changing Conceptions of Education* (1909) he said, "The good old times of our grandfathers are gone never to return. We have a new and vastly more complex civilization. Reading, writing, arithmetic, the staples of the elementary curriculum, are really of little value except as they are closely related with the needs and problems of our social, civic and industrial life." Dr. Cubberley taught that the schools should not be maintained unchanged through eternity, but rather should "anticipate and solve the problems of national welfare." Wisdom did not begin with the educational reformers of the 1970's nor, let us hope, will it die with them.

Finally, Dr. Cubberley stressed that education could become a worthy career. He taught Stanford men and women to take pride in the distinguished history of their profession, to honour its great leaders, and to resist every attempt by a political machine or local minorities to take over the schools. These lessons delivered in a quiet voice in Room 55 on the sunny inner quadrangle at Stanford reached far beyond that room. For half a century these ideas shaped the thinking of an important segment of the leadership of American education.

When Dr. Cubberley reached the age of compulsory retirement, shortly after I had completed my work for the doctorate, I was invited by the Faculty of the School of Education to contribute a chapter to a volume of essays prepared by his colleagues and dedicated to him at the time of his retirement. The book of essays was given the general title "Modern School Administration" and was edited by Professor John C. Almack. Although I had little time and less qualification for such a task, I jumped at the opportunity. It finally appeared as a thirty-page chapter on school personnel administration along with chapters on other topics by some of the nation's most distinguished educators. I made my contribution as solid as I possibly could, –after all, I could not let Dr. Almack down, could I?

David Starr Jordan

In those days the distinguished Chancellor Emeritus of Stanford University, David Starr Jordan, used to give a public lecture every Sunday morning at 10 o'clock just before chapel. I do not believe I ever went to chapel but I did go to hear Dr. Jordan every time I could. It was Dr. Jordan who had won the Raphael Herman Prize for the best plan for promoting international understanding and peace through the schools. One day after his lecture I was bold enough to tell him that I, too, had entered the contest and that during my year at Pacific University I had expanded my entry into a small book. Dr. Jordan immediately asked me to let him see the manuscript.

The next Sunday Dr. Jordan returned the manuscript and said that he had already recommended that it be published by the Stanford University Press.

Education for World Citizenship appeared in October 1928. In the Foreword I said that this was the first extended publication on this subject and that it doubtless exhibited "many of the imperfections of a pioneer work in a rapidly growing and changing field of study." It was well that I put in some such disclaimer, for as I look at it today, I do not know whether most to admire the nerve of the author or to deplore the book's many inadequacies. Still it *was* a groundbreaker and it gave me some small measure of recognition. Indeed, of the reviews sent to me by the professional magazines concerned, ten were generously laudatory, one was mildly critical, and two, in effect, merely listed the principal chapter titles without comment.

One copy of *Education for World Citizenship* landed on the desk of John K. Norton who was then Director of Research for the National Education Association in Washington. Dr. Norton was at that moment looking for another Assistant Director of Research. He sent Miss Margaret Alltucker (who a year later became Mrs. John Norton) to interview me at the CTA offices in San Francisco. When my wife and I returned to Palo Alto in September 1928, from a week's vacation near Lake Tahoe, our first real work-stoppage since our wedding trip, we found a letter inviting me to become Assistant Director of Research at the National Education Association. This proposed dislocation required very careful evaluation. I could have certainly returned to Pacific University as a college teacher or accepted other teaching positions at the university level. I could have expanded my work with the California Teachers Association from part-time to full-time. But here was an invitation to go all the way to Washington, a tremendous distance away, four nights and three days on the train. Dr. Norton proposed an annual salary of $3,750. I determined that I would ask $4,000 or not go. When my "salary negotiation" succeeded, the die was cast. We began to pack, thinking that we might stay in the East three or four years at most before returning to our families and friends in California.

One final note on the Rafael Herman Prize: In 1945, during the San Francisco Conference which wrote the United Nations Charter, I met an editor named Hamilton Holt who later became President of Rollins College at Winter Park, Florida. Mr. Holt had a lifelong interest in peace movements. He told me that he had been one of the judges in the Rafael Herman Prize contest. The judges, he said, had easily decided on David Starr Jordan as the winner. They then decided to agree among themselves, privately, on the second place, partly in case Dr. Jordan might, for some unforeseen reason, be unable or unwilling to accept the prize, and partly to satisfy their own natural curiosity. Mr. Holt told me that I was the stand-by thus selected.

It must have been a long, long step from first to second place. What would have happened to me if I had been suddenly hit in 1924 at age twenty-three with the sum of $25,000? It might well have ruined my career!

3 Research, Recession, Recovery

Washington waits–Propaganda in the schools–How the propaganda problem has changed–Comparing the state school systems–James W. Crabtree–Boom and bust–More children, fewer resources, limited opportunity–The Joint Commission–Reconstruction–"A new type of thinking."

On January 2, 1929 at six o'clock in the morning the Crescent Limited pulled into Washington Union Station from Los Angeles by way of New Orleans. My wife and I left the platform with our two-year-old son, all very tired after the long journey, climbed the steep stairs from the Southern Railway tracks into the station and came thus to the capital of the United States.

Washington waits

Washington Union Station was then an impressive piece of architecture in the Beaux Arts style–one great unbroken hall, vaulted, exquisitely proportioned, uncluttered. No one had yet added the dirty little shed for the station master, or defiled the elegance of the concourse with a garish corner for pin-ball machines, or hoisted neon signs to huckster whisky, tobacco, or detergents. In the great waiting room, high above the marble walls, several pairs of heroic statues gazed down impassively on the bustling scene.

We went on through the station and emerged into the great semicircular plaza before it, a park where the bare trees of winter were just beginning to show through the morning mist. We could dimly see and clearly hear the Columbus fountain splashing where the great navigator stands in marble on the prow of his ship, looking stubbornly southward (when he ought to be looking westward). But our eyes were fixed chiefly on the illuminated dome of the Capitol seeming almost to float against the early morning sky.

In 1929 the nation was keeping cool with Coolidge. Herbert Hoover was enroute to his inauguration as the President of the United States. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee was about to ratify the Pact of Paris which provided that the nations would renounce war forever as an instrument of national policy. Admiral Byrd was building in the Antarctic a base which later became known as "Little America." There was a military revolt in Spain and Mussolini was coming to power in Italy. Josef Stalin would in a few months become the ruler of the greatest land mass in the world and inaugurate a reign of terror rarely, if ever, equalled in human history. In Africa, Haile Selassie had just taken over the throne of the Lion of Judah. In Turkey, Kemal Ataturk was trying to move his country in a single generation from the Seventeenth to the Twentieth Century. Further to the east two friends named Gandhi and Nehru were struggling to secure self-government or independence for India, while to the north a young soldier named Mao Tse-tung was making guerilla war against the government of China. Meanwhile, in Washington, the Congress of the United States was debating the tariff and prohibition during a year of frenzied stock market speculation.

When I began my work at the National Education Association, the entire staff of the Association was comfortably housed in a four-story remodeled residence popularly called the Guggenheim Mansion. It stood at 1201 Sixteenth Street, which is the address of the present NEA headquarters. Forty people could work in the Guggenheim Mansion without serious crowding.

Most of the dozen men on the staff took lunch together daily at a nearby restaurant. A large round table was reserved for us. These luncheons at the Iron Gate were an introduction to the current problems of American education, for whenever an educational leader visited Washington, he usually came to the NEA headquarters and took lunch with us. This procedure lasted four or five years. About 1934, the management of the Iron Gate advanced the price of a three-course luncheon, including tip, from 40 cents to 45 cents per person. With genuine indignation we all rejected this drastic inflation in the cost of living and the Iron Gate luncheon group moved into history.

Memory will not supply a complete list of my varied assignments during my first few years at the NEA. A few examples must serve.

Propaganda in the schools

My very first assignment was to write a report for the NEA Committee on Propaganda in the Schools. Using my home address as a decoy I got my name on as many mailing lists as I could to receive material from advertisers and promoters who were trying to influence the schools. From this flood of material, I acquired the wrath of the local postman and enough ideas to draft the report.

Then, as now, efforts to influence the curriculum and the general policy of the public schools were numerous and persistent. In the draft report, I tried not to use "propaganda" as a pejorative word. Instead it was defined simply as a systematic effort to win agreement with a social, political, or economic opinion or policy. The 1929 NEA Report on Propaganda in the Schools came at a time when voluminous reports of Federal Trade Commission investigations had called attention to expenditures in the millions of dollars by the electric power lobby to oppose the public ownership and operation of electric utility systems. It appeared also that these efforts included attempts to influence the preparation and selection of school textbooks at every level of education.

Some saw in these developments a sinister use of deceit to manipulate public opinion. I did not share this alarm for it seemed to me that propagandists could seek high-minded and altruistic ideals at least as often and as well as selfish or venal objectives. As long as advertising in all its forms was available to the adult population, it seemed to me fruitless to try to teach a generation as though advertising did not exist. Better, I argued, to teach about propaganda and advertising in the classroom so that the oncoming generation would be able to deal with these powerful forces.

If any proof were needed of the general belief in the power of schools to shape attitudes and to determine modes of behavior, one could find that proof in the dogged attempts of every advertiser and publicity agent to place his products and his opinions before young America in the classroom. At the time of the NEA report (1929) about half of the governing boards of city school systems had found it necessary to consider the questions arising from the pressure of outside influences on the schools. Two-thirds of the larger school systems had adopted explicit rules regarding the handling of "outside materials." Nearly all of these city school systems had set up special administrative agencies for this purpose. Twenty-one states had taken similar steps in the form of statutes, or action by state school boards, or official action by chief state school officers.

But the problems involved were not easily solved. The pressures were then, as now, intense: Do we need to raise money for a worthy charity? Let the school children be our campaign workers. Do we want a birdbath in the city park? Let each child bring a dime to school next Monday and the thing is as good as done. Does the quality of our national citizenship appear to be declining? Let us enact a regulation that every class in every school study the Constitution of the United States at least 15 minutes per week. Are we dealers in musical instruments and would we like to sell more of them? Let us impress on teachers and school administrators the important role of music in the curriculum of a modern school.

An army of propagandists stands at the schoolhouse door. The school official within is perplexed, sometimes to the point of distraction. Shall we fling the door wide open and let the invading army take possession? Or shall we bolt the door and put up a "No Admittance" sign? Shall we let a select few of the army enter quietly by the back door? If so, how to justify this action to those excluded? While we ponder, the knocking at the gate becomes louder and more frenzied.

At various times over the years the principal weapons used by the invaders have changed. At the time I wrote the report the most formidable weapon was state legislation which specified what could not be taught and what must be taught. This is no longer regarded as such a serious danger as it was in the years before World War II.

The efforts to modify textbooks are still numerous but are seldom effective. The resistance of publishers, authors, and the teachers themselves to this kind of outside pressure remains strong. Efforts will undoubtedly continue to be made to modify textbooks. Occasionally, some of them will succeed. On the whole, balancing the good and the bad effects, it would be desirable if changes in texts could be made more easily and up-to-date information and concepts more easily introduced.

The problems of propaganda in the schools would evaporate if the concept of their role in society were thoroughly simplified. If the schools taught only reading, penmanship, the alphabet, the multiplication table, the rules of grammar, and a few other basic skills, the problem of school propaganda would scarcely arise. But in 1929, no more than it is nowadays, the public was not willing to settle for a program of public education of deliberate social insignificance. The public which has established the schools, provided the children to attend them, and provided taxes to finance them demands a curriculum which can be related to the life and the needs of the present and the future. But the schools could not serve such a role if they were isolated from the demands and issues of modern life.

A few paragraphs ago, we left a school administrator deep in thought while the propagandists hammered at the gate. It is now clear that the door must be opened. Indiscriminately free access need not be given to cranks and sages, rascals,and honest folk. The credentials of those who seek access to the schools must be evaluated according to the extent to which they can help the school to attain the objectives which society has set before it. As Professor T. H. Briggs said in the Inglis Lecture for 1930, "Genuine education is dangerous for it leads to positive action affecting the social body. Conversely, when education is not dangerous, it is not important."

Following are a few other recommendations from my 1929 study of propaganda in the schools:

Textbooks. School boards charged with the duty of textbook selection should invariably secure and follow competent professional advice.

Contests are, as a rule, of doubtful educational value. Group prizes are preferable to individual prizes. (In the years since 1929, the National Association of Secondary School Principals has developed a useful device to help schools deal with the seemingly endless flood of contests. A committee of the Association issues from year to year a list of approved contests.)

Speakers. Attempts to compel superintendents, principals, and teachers to open their classes and assembly halls to unauthorized propagandists should be briskly discouraged.

Debatable issues. Schools should not cast the minds of children in inflexible molds. Altered conditions in the future may require changes in currently accepted customs. The schools should encourage a certain flexibility of mind which permits social evolution.

How the propaganda problem has changed

Many changes have occurred since 1929 in the way propaganda touches the school. The mechanical and technological changes are most easily noticed. The large home or classroom radio receiver, housed in a massive and almost immovable console, has been supplemented in two major ways. First, by means of stereophonic reception and other improvements, the quality and tone of radio reception has been greatly improved. Second, highly portable, inexpensive, transistorized radios, with availability of frequency modulation, have modified the listening habits of the nation.

The extensive changes in radio, however, are all but unnoticed under the crashing impact of television, with steadily improving quality of sound and image, ease of operation, the "instant replay" technique, the availability of color, satellite-aided global transmission, video-tapes, and (very soon) a much larger choice of programs through cable-assisted transmission.

Other less tangible, but equally powerful, additions to the techniques of propaganda have been developed. They include opinion sampling, public opinion polls and surveys, the early prediction of election results through the application of computer processing to objectively selected samples, and the use of subliminal stimuli. One of the most notable of the new techniques is the staged non-event which is a telecast devised to make a maximum impact on a national television audience rather than to perform its pretended function. Examples of this contrivance include much of the national political nominating conventions, the visit of the American President to the People's Republic of China, the Oscar awards of the National Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, and the quadrennial Presidential inaugurations.

What has happened, I believe, is that the 1929 concern about "Propaganda in the Schools" has been transformed into a concern to secure constructive citizen participation in the formation of educational goals, policies, and practices.

American citizens are striving in greater measure than before to make education serve their personal and social needs. The situation has grown chaotic because of the multiplicity and sincerity of civic opinions about education. But the hope to isolate the school from all propaganda has proved to be an illusion.

When the report was published it contained the names of all the members of the Committee, none of whom had done any work except to read the manuscript and make a few minor suggestions. There was no reference to the fact that I had prepared the report. On this first occasion, which has since then been frequently repeated, my anonymous and invisible position troubled me a little. When I asked for an explanation, I was told two things. First, while I was an employee of the National Education Association whatever I might write or say or do was the property of the Association; and second, that I should not worry about personal recognition because the important people would know that I had written the report and the ignorance of the rest of the readers would do me no harm. I accepted this policy cheerfully and worked under it for some forty years. In retrospect, it does not appear to have been a bad arrangement from my own point of view. For although I have written much that appears to have been useful and influential for which I received no credit, it is also true that anonymity protected me in cases where my writing was ill-advised.

The report of the Committee on Propaganda in the Schools required only a few months of my time. In the ensuing years, I performed dozens, probably hundreds, of similar assignments, many of which I now have difficulty in recalling.

Comparing the state school systems

One of the larger projects of my early years at the National Education Association was the preparation of a Research Bulletin on the relative educational efficiency of the several states. This task had been first approached by Leonard Ayres who in 1920 prepared an index of state school efficiency. This pioneer work was unsatisfactory in many respects and it was thought that the NEA, through me, could do a better job.

Retrospectively, I can see that the effort to design a way to measure the comparative efficiency of the (then) 48 state school systems was beyond the capabilities of educational research at the time—and certainly grotesquely beyond the capacities of one inexperienced research worker. With the cold clear light of hindsight it is easy to perceive that such an assignment should never have been confidently made or eagerly accepted.

But to judge the wisdom of such an effort in the light of today's knowledge would fail to recognize an important and, at that time, a widely-accepted concept, the reverential respect accorded to educational research and its proximate possibilities.

It was troublesome, but by no means impossible, to list the characteristics of a good state school administrative system, teacher preparation and certification, free textbook provisions, teachers' salary and retirement legislation, and so on. The unmarked reef, on which the entire project was to founder, was the inability to establish any rational basis for determining the *relative* importance of each of these items. Was a good state textbook law equal in importance to a good state law governing the tenure of teachers? Or were the textbook provisions ten times more important to the success of a state school system? Or one-tenth as important? There was simply no rational way to deal with the weighting of the various components.

So, I found that I really could not estimate the effectiveness of a state school system. It is a small but soothing consolation to note that no one else has been able to do it either.

I was ultimately obliged to terminate this project by listing all the important characteristics of a good state school system, as then understood, showing the justification and importance of each, and inviting each state to rate itself. There was no summary for each state and therefore no state-to-state comparison.

In the course of writing the two volumes on evaluating state school systems which the Research Division eventually published, I was sent to visit almost every one of the 48 State Boards of Education and of the 48 State Education Associations affiliated to the NEA. Thus I had a unique opportunity to travel throughout the United States to gather materials and ideas. It was fortunate that the Association had funds for such a purpose at that particular time because there was, just below the horizon, an event which dramatically shook and revised not merely the National Education Association, but also the American economic system.

That event was the stock market crash and the economic depression which followed.

James W. Crabtree

Before describing these events, and their impact on education, I should bring the more personal record up to date. Dr. John Norton, Director of the Research Division, took a year's leave of absence in 1930-31 to study and teach at Columbia University. Early in 1931 he decided to remain at Columbia and submitted his resignation. After a brief period of consideration, Mr. James W. Crabtree, the NEA Executive Secretary at that time, asked me to become Director of Research. I accepted readily and after the termination of Dr. Norton's contract, I became Director of Research at the National Education Association June 1, 1931. It was my thirtieth birthday.

Mr. Crabtree became the Executive Secretary of the NEA in 1917. He retired in 1934. In the intervening 17 years the membership of the Association grew from 8,000 to 154,000. His administration sought to attain such major goals as unified membership in professional associations, trained teachers in every classroom, the participation of teachers in making school policies, and the establishment in Washington of a small but competent headquarters staff.

Mr. Crabtree was born in 1864. In the seventies his family moved to western Nebraska where they lived in one of the frontier sodhouses. He worked his way through the State Normal School at Peru, Nebraska. A man of simple tastes, he was completely dedicated to the preservation of the integrity of the teaching profession. He used to begin work in his office about 6:30 every morning and by the time most of us arrived at 8:15 he had completed his office work. None of us who worked with him in the "Guggenheim" at 16th and M will forget that every night when the office closed at 5 o'clock, he took up his position at the outer door of the building and courteously and individually bade each of us a pleasant good evening. In those days a staff of 40 persons was regarded as a very large, perhaps an unwieldy, body.

I owe a great deal not only to the example of unassuming industry which Mr. Crabtree set but also to his confidence in appointing me Director of Research. He gave me every assistance to meet this new responsibility. I was therefore exceptionally pleased, when I became Executive Secretary myself, to recommend to the Trustees that the auditorium in the new building be named the Crabtree Auditorium and to preside at a commemoration of the

Hundredth Anniversary of his birth at a special Service Award Program there on April 17, 1964, with members of the Crabtree family and of the NEA Board of Trustees in attendance.

Boom and bust

Most of the 1920's had been for many Americans years of golden prosperity. Industrial activity was expanding, incomes and profits rose to new heights, and a wave of speculation hurried the prices of common stocks constantly upward. Many people were buying securities in a process which was essentially gambling. The end of an epoch came with a stock market crash that was felt around the world. Late in October 1929 high grade stocks lost $20 to $40 per day on the New York Stock Exchange. Within two weeks 35 billion dollars of market value of stocks was erased. These events were followed by a long, profound, and tragic economic depression. Business inactivity produced unemployment, unemployment reduced purchasing power, this reduction in purchasing power caused a further slump in industrial production, and so the vicious cycle continued. Not until Franklin Roosevelt became President and proposed the New Deal legislation in 1933, was there a perceptible upward movement in the American economy. The education system bore its full share of suffering.

In the general economic debacle one of the most distressing symptoms was widespread unemployment. The lack of jobs was in some ways worse than an acute epidemic. With less obvious symptoms, unemployment was a chronic ailment of the United States economy. A committee of economic experts appointed by President Hoover reported that even in years of general prosperity and vigorous business activity there had been "a persistent and large volume of unemployment." The average number of unemployed in 1927, a year of prosperity, was estimated at well over two million, not including those who sought employment in farming.

Our own NEA calculations showed that in "normal" times, the number of school-age children at work exceeded the number of unemployed adults.

In an article for the *New York Herald-Tribune* of December 28, 1930, I pointed out that to shift the school-age children from jobs to school would open up as many jobs as the then current number of adult unemployed, call for at least 80,000 additional teachers and 20,000 other school employees, and stimulate the building industry to construct the necessary schools. Such a shift would require that about 3.1 percent of the gross national product be spent for education instead of the then current 2.5 percent.

As a matter of fact, the economic depression did accelerate the normal rate of increase in high school enrollment. In Chicago, as a single example, the increase in high school enrollments in 1930 and 1931 was nearly double that of the two previous pre-depression years. Chicago was in many ways the hardest hit school system among all the large cities of America. Month after month, new financial hardships and deprivation fell upon the teachers and other school personnel. From their own slender and impaired resources, teachers contributed to the relief of cold, hungry, and frightened school children. Teachers were paid in depreciated and scarcely negotiable scrip. As schools opened in the autumn of 1933 the indebtedness of local school districts to their employees rose to about $40 million, more than half of this total indebtedness being consolidated in the school district of Chicago.

In other parts of the country, according to our reports, 300 schools serving 50,000 children did not open at all, and 5,000 schools serving 500,000 students planned to operate for less than six months. Most of these were in rural areas. But with few exceptions the devoted teachers somehow kept the schools open. The educational rights of the children were remembered by the teachers although others forgot them. The nation's school staff maintained a high morale which helped the entire community and the entire nation. Would that record be repeated today if a similar crisis arose?

More children, fewer resources, limited opportunity

The depression period in education, across the nation as a whole, was marked by three major trends: (1) Increasing responsibilities; (2) Decreasing resources; (3) Restricted educational opportunity.

The increasing responsibilities reflected not only the normal population growth but also, especially in secondary and higher education, the larger numbers of youth remaining in schools because of limited employment opportunities. Vocational education, including evening classes, was in growing demand because of job shortages. The schools were called upon to administer a wide variety of emergency relief services. Psychological difficulties exhibited by some children and youth as a result of family instability created by the depression added still further to the task.

The decreasing resources were not immediately felt in the schools. The first decrease in funds for schools came in 1931 but after that year school budgets declined at an ever-accelerating pace. By 1933 total public school funds were down 20 percent although nearly two million more children were enrolled. Just as the depression's impact was felt a year later in the schools than in other aspects of life, so its paralyzing burdens remained with the schools for about a year after recovery was observed in other elements of the national economy.

Caught between conflicting pressures the schools had to curtail opportunities. Children were enrolled in two-shift or even three-shift schools. Textbook purchases were cut by a third. Music, art, home economics, physical education, evening schools, and classes for handicapped children were among the aspects of the school program most frequently curtailed or eliminated. By 1933 confidence in public education was being rapidly eroded. In some areas, schools ceased to be free; schoolhouse doors were locked. Only those who could pay tuition could attend. Although such cases were few, the depression had begun to challenge the very existence of the public school system.

A study which I wrote in 1933 gives some idea of the varying scope of the damage done to the schools in different parts of the country. On the whole, the North Atlantic area felt the impact least. There was no important effort to close schools early in this area, and school budgets were reasonably well-maintained except for substantial reductions in the salaries of teachers. New York State enlarged its State School Fund and was thus able to protect educational programs to some degree.

Those areas which in general had enjoyed better schools before the depression lost least during the depression. From those who had little, much was taken away.

In spite of a few bright spots, the loss to the nation and to the youth directly concerned was grievous and in many cases irreparable. The children became, as Governor Pinchot of Pennsylvania put it, "the innocent victims of a mismanaged society." Children were sent home from kindergartens. Supplies needed for instruction were not bought. The supervisory and administrative staffs were decimated or even destroyed. School buildings stood in want of repairs while jobless carpenters walked the surrounding streets. School libraries were instructed to buy no more books. School nurses were dismissed and other school health services were discontinued. Playgrounds, summer schools, and related community activities were locked up. School counseling services were speeded up so that their function in the guidance of boys and girls was largely unfulfilled. No single community had suffered all of these blows simultaneously but fear and anxiety were pervasive and the trends of the general economic situation offered most realistic observers a bleak and pessimistic prospect. Few people seemed to be listening when President Hoover flatly declared that "*the very first* obligation upon the national resources is the undiminished support of the public schools."

In this situation, the National Education Association insisted that childhood was not the Jonah of the depression and that to throw the children overboard would not calm the raging seas of economic upheaval.

The Joint Commission

In February 1933, the NEA and its Department of Superintendence established a Joint Commission on the Emergency in Education.

I was assigned to serve as its executive officer and my former chief, John K. Norton, was named its chairman. The Commission was an agency to help the schools to sustain morale and to meet the most catastrophic effects of the depression. We devised a number of supporting procedures with these objectives in mind.

One of these procedures was to appoint a board of 900 consultants, ex-officio. For example, the consultants included the presidents and executive secretaries of the affiliated state education associations. The consultant appointments were announced with a public flourish and were often carried in hometown newspapers.

The consultants were frequently invited to write letters of advice and these letters were taken seriously. The consultants received a bi-weekly newsletter from the Joint Commission and were invited to its regional meetings.

Regional conferences were held as frequently as resources permitted. In one 20-month period, 16 such conferences were held. To save staff time and travel expense, the conferences were scheduled as closely together as possible. Here is a typical series of six in late 1934:

October 27 – Chicago
October 29 – Minneapolis
October 31 – Cheyenne
November 1 – Ogden
November 3 – Portland
November 5 – Oakland

I travelled by train and, as a rule, by night. Arriving at a regional conference city, I would proceed to the designated conference hotel, unpack, set up the travelling exhibit, meet the press, hold the meeting, prepare a summary to be distributed as the conference ended, pay the bills, pack up the exhibit, and entrain for the next conference site. At some points a member of the Commission would join the road show for a day, but for the most part I worked all alone.

The Joint Commission worked in close cooperation with the NEA Legislative Commission to secure emergency help for the schools from Congress and the Roosevelt Administration. In this way we secured emergency grants and loans to build schools, to pay teachers' salaries that were most seriously in arrears, and to keep rural schools open.

In cooperation with Dr. Harley Lutz, Professor of Public Finance at Princeton University, I wrote a small book on "Essentials of Taxation." This volume first appeared serially in the *NEA Journal.* Later, the Joint Commission sponsored a reprint to which it gave wide general distribution. We hoped that better public understanding of the basic principles of public finance would produce more informed decisions on school support by the electorate.

Although President Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal did not act on education swiftly enough or directly enough to satisfy our Commission on the Emergency, it became clear by 1936 that the worst of the depression's impact on the schools was over.

Reconstruction

As attention turned to the future, a period of educational reconstruction was foreseen. First, and most obvious, was the recovery from the series of financial hardships afflicting the schools–difficulties that ranged all the way from minor curtailments of what some people called "fads and frills" in education to the complete bankruptcy of entire school systems involving suspension of educational services for lack of funds.

The second aspect of reconstruction was less obvious but at least equally important. This aspect of the recovery was concerned with the new demands confronting public schools arising from new economic and social conditions.

As to the financial reconstruction, it would be an error to suppose that the fiscal difficulties of the schools arose solely from the depression and would disappear with it. The depression had struck the schools like an earthquake shock but the crumbling structure had weaknesses which had existed long before the stock market crash of 1929. The excessive reliance of the schools on the local property tax was a source of danger. It was not only a weak, unstable base of support but also an essentially unjust method of financing an important public service. The fiscal weaknesses inherent in the small local school districts and the political weaknesses of many of the county school administrations were other factors of long standing to which experts in public finance had time and again drawn the attention of state legislatures. But in the basements and storerooms of many a state capital the carefully considered reports of expert survey commissions were covered with dust and cobwebs. It required the vigorous shaking of a major economic tragedy to reveal to many people the weakness of the timbers supporting their state school systems. After the depression the role of the states in supporting education took a sharp upward turn.

By 1936 recovery had clearly begun. In the elections of November 1936, 15 states conducted referenda on aspects of the educational program. In 14 out of the 15 states, the schools were supported by the popular vote. For example, the voters in Arkansas and Louisiana passed legislation providing free textbooks. In California, an attempt to repeal the existing state personal income tax was defeated while Colorado adopted a state income tax for the support of schools and other local government needs. Measures to place a ceiling limit on local school taxes went down to defeat in four states.

Federal and local activity, however, were lagging in contrast to the successes at the state level. True, the new Public Works Administration provided some funds for school repair and construction. But neither Congress nor the White House did enough to assist education. The Congress and the President were enacting legislation to control crime, improve public health, and to safeguard natural resources.

Federal funds were needed to shore up the support for schools in those areas where combined state and local efforts were inadequate. That proposal soared like a lead balloon. *Three more decades of work* were required before any significant national or federal action was taken.

Meanwhile, the rate of recovery in education seemed maddeningly slow. I calculated that, if school finance continued to improve at the rate established in 1934-35, some 40 years would elapse before school support would regain the 1929 level. Fortunately, we did much better than that.

The second phase of needed reconstruction in education had to do not with money but with objectives. Unfortunately, the activities of the schools which are most worth financing are often the ones that receive the least public support and even, in some cases, the most vigorous hostility. The school activities which prepare youth for citizenship in the twentieth century, which help them to make good use of their leisure time, which develop habits of reflective thinking and cooperative action, which contribute to health of both body and mind—these were in those days assailed as unnecessary extravagances.

In fact, however, the real extravagance and waste should have been sought elsewhere—in school organization that forbids or discourages the recognition of children's individuality, where teachers fear to think for themselves or to try new procedures, where the emphasis in instruction is to glorify what is and to resist consideration of what might be, where textbooks are outdated, school supplies skimped as a matter of policy, and school research and development programs starved for support.

"A new type of thinking"

In its final report, July 1935, the Joint Commission on the Emergency in Education made a recommendation which, when adopted, was destined to have great significance to American education, to the NEA, and to me, personally. The Joint Commission proposed that its two sponsoring agencies create an Educational Policies Commission "to bring a new type of thinking and higher statesmanship into the process of adapting educational institutions to the ever-changing needs of our dynamic democracy." The new Commission could provide for continuing self-appraisal of the

American system of education and develop a program whereby needed changes in educational institutions could be more speedily accomplished. It was reasoned that, since the current problems of the schools had their roots in conditions which existed long before the depression, the educational recovery then beginning should mean more than merely a return to 1929. The Joint Commission, anticipating that its last recommendation would be accepted, had already opened discussions with Dr. Edmund Ezra Day, President of the General Education Board, a Rockefeller-financed foundation, looking toward a substantial grant for this new unit in the NEA structure.

In the 30 months of its existence, the Joint Commission spent $21,481.28. This sum included a gift of $4,750 from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching to help finance a National Conference on the Financing of Education. The remainder of the expenses, amounting to about $8,365 each, were shared equally by the NEA and the Department of Superintendence.

Commenting in its final report on the financing of its work, the Joint Commission noted that the expenses of the headquarters staff were not included. The Joint Commission added that, "it frequently has been necessary for these employees to perform the work of the Commission as additional assignments to already overfilled programs." This added work, the Joint Commission said, "has been accepted willingly and carried out with enthusiasm . . . devoted and efficient."

As it is now some 40 years since these words were published, it may not be considered excessively boastful if, as the principal member of the Joint Commission's staff, I say that their report in this respect was absolutely correct. We worked our heads off.

The work of the Commission members and especially of John K. Norton, its resourceful, patient, and tireless Chairman, can never be too highly extolled. The nation's schools and the National Education Association are both deeply in his debt, and I personally owe him much.

I regarded with almost reverent enthusiasm the prospect of the proposed new Educational Policies Commission, with funds of its own, to relieve the increasingly heavy load I had carried since I came to Washington. It was not that I minded being fully occupied but I was concerned—partly because the work might make me neglect my wife and our young son—and partly because I feared that the quality of my work might diminish.

But there was another, more profound reason for my interest in the proposal for the new Commission: its inherent boldness. No such conscious use of education had given rise to the Roman Empire, the Renaissance, the Reformation, or the French Revolution. The Educational Policies Commission was designed to offer a leadership within the schools and colleges of the country which might, perhaps for the first time in history, make possible the adjustment of a formal educational system to the dynamic forces which were changing the world. What a challenge! And what an adventure just to have a go at it—win, lose, or draw!

4 Educational Policies Commission: Five Basic Documents

Beginnings–How the Commission worked–Policies for the Policies Commission–Priorities and sequences–The Unique Function–The Structure and Administration–Purposes: the problem–Purposes: the proposal–Economic Well-being: the problem–Economic Well-being; the proposal–Free Men.

Since the Educational Policies Commission was an outgrowth of the Joint Commission on the Emergency in Education, I was directed to prepare an agenda and to make the physical arrangements for the first EPC meeting. There were no absentees at that first meeting. Indeed, there were remarkably few absentees at subsequent meetings.

Beginnings

For many years appointment to the Educational Policies Commission was regarded as the highest honor that could come to any educator. No Commissioner would have lightly proposed the excuse of a conflicting engagement for absence from a meeting. When the invitation to become a member was issued, the priority of the Commission business was stressed. If some prospective member had declined to accept this priority, the invitation would have been immediately withdrawn. However, I never heard of such a contingency. For example, when Dwight Eisenhower, then President of Columbia University, attended his first Commission meeting he responded to greetings by saying with a smile, "If you had delayed my invitation much longer, I would have asked for the appointment," Even after he left Columbia to take command of NATO, General Eisenhower continued to be an active, highly concerned, and responsive member of the Commission. Other members were similarly devoted.

When the Educational Policies Commission held its first meeting in January 1936, no one had any very coherent or clear idea of how it was to work. The large objective had been defined, but the more immediate steps and methods were yet to be devised. During that first meeting, the Commission went into Executive Session for the purpose of choosing its executive officer. When a subcommittee came to ask me to assume that position myself, I objected that I was already Director of the growing NEA Research Division. The subcommittee replied that I could remain as Director of the general policies of the Research Division and also serve simultaneously with the Educational Policies Commission. Under these circumstances, I accepted the appointment. The subcommittee and I discussed the title which the position should carry. Someone suggested that I be known as the Secretary of the Commission. Others thought that the term Secretary did not carry enough prestige, but I remarked that Horace Mann had accomplished a great deal as Secretary (of the Massachusetts State Board of Education) and that I would be honored and content with the same title.

In order that I might give the bulk of my time to the Commission, Dr. Frank Hubbard became Associate Director of the Research Division and was, in effect, its executive officer. In 1941, when the first five years of the Educational Policies Commission had ended and it was decided to keep the Commission going for an indeterminate future, Dr. Hubbard had such a complete grasp of the work of the Research Division and enjoyed so fully the confidence and respect of the entire educational community, that he became Director of the Division while I was named Secretary of the Educational Policies Commission and Associate Secretary of the National Education Association. In this latter capacity I was made the coordinator of the NEA's departments and was Acting Executive Secretary of the NEA on the rare occasions when Dr. Willard Givens, the Exeuctive Secretary, was absent.

How the Commission worked

A word now about the working habits of the Educational Policies Commission. The Chairman of the Commission for its first ten years was Alexander J. Stoddard, a man of great energy, personal charm, resourcefulness, and creative imagination. The Commission met, during the first three or four years of its existence, at least three times a year and throughout its history no less than twice a year. In the early days Commission meetings lasted four days; later it was found possible to complete the business in three days.

At the outset, the schedule for meetings was normally three sessions a day; a morning session followed by a rather short lunch, an afternoon session of about four hours followed by a leisurely dinner, and finally an evening session limited to three hours at the most. As long as most of the members of the Commission came to the meeting by train, their attendance was much more regular and their participation more active than was the case in subsequent years when travel by air became common. Instead of releasing more time for meetings, rapid air travel appears to increase demands for shorter sessions, superficial debate, and hasty conclusions.

Younger readers may find it difficult to believe that, only a few years ago, it was by no means unusual for an important committee to remain in deliberative session for three or even four hours. The coffee break has put an end to all that and has, on many occasions, made productive debate all but impossible. However, the Educational Policies Commission, in its early years, abjured such luxuries. The members paid attention to business and never realized what they were missing.

The continuity of discussion, the sense of history and of mission, the lack of pressure to try to catch the plane one hour earlier, and many other factors, resulted in meetings of the Educational Policies Commission which were genuinely deliberative.

The way in which the Commission brought its reports into final shape should be emphasized: every report was read *in detail* by every member of the Commission. After the Commission voted to approve a prospectus or plan for a report, a member of the Commission, or one of the staff, or an outside expert was assigned to prepare a first draft. It was not uncommon for these drafts to go through as many as ten revisions. Sometimes the Commission set up a subcommittee for this purpose but in all cases the Commission as a whole read the final text together and discussed it page by page, line by line. This was tiring, slogging work, both for the staff and the Commission, but I believe it paid off.

The Commission kept two kinds of records of its meetings: the verbatim stenotype transcript and the official minutes which recorded only the major points discussed and the decisions reached. I made it a point of considerable importance to myself that the minutes would be ready to distribute when I returned to my office in Washington after a Commission meeting. Thus, within a week at most, all who participated in the meeting had a written reminder of what had been decided.

Policies for the Policies Commission

The Commission began its work with several rather definite guide posts in mind. These five principles of operation were formulated after I had spent nearly all of my first three months as the Commission's Secretary in a series of planned interviews with leaders in American thought.

First, we intended to develop educational policy, insofar as possible, in terms of the findings of research. The fact-analyzing and the policy-proposing functions were equal and simultaneous.

The dictionaries define *policy* as *a plan of action, especially public action.* These two ideas–*plan* and *action*–were both emphasized in the early development of the Educational Policies Commission. As for planning, the depression had no doubt sharpened the critical sense of both the public and the profession. As better times slowly arrived, an opportunity for appraisal and planning was an attractive prospect. A mere return to "the good old days," all agreed, was not enough. But, as usual in such circumstances, the faults of the old education were much easier to discern than were the outlines of the new education to be proposed. The next few years would be important ones for the schools, marked by efforts not only to restore the best of the old but also to plan the new. We hoped to make the Educational Policies Commission contribute usefully to this process.

The Educational Policies Commission did not yearn to furnish the shelves of pedagogical libraries with additional decorative materials. It was recognized that the best way to secure attention to its proposals was a sincerely cooperative plan of work from the outset. The appointment of a large and representative group of consultants was one of the Commission's means to this end. The preparation and wide circulation of concise lists of educational issues was planned. Opportunities were sought to discuss these issues at regional meetings. A clearinghouse was established for the reports of national deliberative committees dealing with education.

Second, we announced our willing acceptance of the fact that educational policies grew out of state and local decisions. We asked that our policies be accepted (or rejected) on their merits and never on the basis of the supposed prestige or authority of the Commission. This proposition seemed so self-evident that one might think that it need scarcely be mentioned. However, we found that, in fact, this reliance on persuasion rather than prestige, was very difficult to observe in practice. For one thing, the prestige of the members of the Commission was an important factor in securing *initial* attention to its proposals. Besides, in education as in every other human activity, there are fashions; and it was possible for a *new* deliberative body to secure attention in the highly competitive market-place of educational ideas.

Third, the Commission in its work consistently related educational problems to their economic, social, and political settings. An important educational policy, the members believed, was a policy with important social implications. The Commission in the crucial early years of its existence maintained close cooperation with various state and national planning agencies, public or private. Furthermore, the Commission frequently sought the advice of leading economists, political scientists, sociologists, and other scholars.

Fourth, the Commission announced a policy for itself—the necessity of flexibility. We knew that we could not thrust all the schools and colleges of the United States into a single mold and we declared (I believe with sincerity) that we would not do so even if we could. We thought the idea of *planning* was more important than any single *plan*. We were acutely aware of the great variety of local circumstances affecting schools in this vast country, and we said that change and uncertainty are the marks, the necessary conditions for survival of education in the United States in this century. We invited and encouraged our advisors to receive our suggestions in a spirit of benign skepticism.

Fifth, we felt that American education should be a continuous pattern and that its policies must take into account the special needs and problems of each level of organized schooling from nursery school to adult and graduate education. We announced frankly that we would be aggressive with respect to gaining widespread attention to our observations and if possible widespread approval and prompt action. We were determined to distinguish our planning from dreaming.

Priorities and sequences

Turning from procedures to substance, the Commission began by dividing the whole area of education into manageable units and planning a series of publications on each. These plans were in an almost constant process of revision, but at any given moment it was possible to produce a chart which showed what the Commission had done, what it was working on, and to what it would turn next.

The question of priority was always central. The Commission therefore concentrated a great deal of attention on the sequence and methods in which the problems of education could best be analyzed and discussed. Out of this procedure, there emerged a decision that there would be a series of five major Commission publications–the first of which would deal with the historical and political roots of freedom in the American system of education.

The concept of "academic freedom," then as now, was widely misunderstood. The term should not mean that the people and their elected representatives in legislatures and school boards lack all authority in the conduct of the schools. It should mean, rather, that public authority should not interfere with the efforts of teachers to be impartial and realistic in the classroom or with the good administration of the school system.

The point of initial danger was often the enactment of state legislation requiring the schools to cater to special interests. The result of such policies would ultimately mean an educational program which is a collection of phobias and prejudices.

Another challenge to the freedom of the schools was the effort to make public education one of the subordinate departments of municipal government. At the college level, too, there was a rising tide of efforts, beginning about 1910, to put public higher education under the control of state executives.

The Unique Function

The Educational Policies Commission thus decided that resistance to this trend and its subsequent reversal should be the theme of its first major report.

It was also decided that, for any topic selected, the Commission would endeavor to secure as its writer the most competent and distinguished person available. Thus, for its first project the Commission secured the services of Charles A. Beard, one of the nation's most distinguished (and controversial) historians. Dr. Beard's insight into the history of democratic institutions was invaluable. He set a high standard of literary excellence for all subsequent publications of the Commission. Because the necessity for freedom in American education grows so naturally out of the role of education in our society, the volume is entitled, *The Unique Function of Education in American Democracy.* The first draft was completed in about three months.

The volume declared that education is distinguished from other public services because it has obligations of its own. Without education the other public services are scarcely possible.

Furthermore, a board of school or college trustees has contacts with society as a whole and a range of power over individuals more compelling than, for instance, a public board which regulates railway rates or the trade practices of industries.

It was freely admitted that education is but one of many services which have claims on the public purse. The Commission associated itself with the efforts for economy and efficiency in public agencies, the need to place public service employment on a merit basis, opposition to the spoils system, the desire to secure full value for tax dollars, the need for equity in taxes and in tax administration, the importance of budgeting in the public services, and the need to avoid both competition and wasteful duplication among them.

But the Commission would not carry its agreement so far as to make education merely a dependency of public administration, headed by a single political officer and financed as one more division of a general all-inclusive budget. Such proposals, although often advocated as wholesome measures of economy and effectiveness, were regarded by the Commission as a dangerous assault on the degree of independence which the schools of a free country should maintain. The necessary degree of educational autonomy would not cut education off from the surrounding society or from the considered, long-run judgments of the American people. The schools, as basic institutions of democracy, must not be governed either by plebiscite or by privilege.

There were other grounds for supporting educational independence. The teachings of science are not dependent on popular opinion; two times two are four even if a majority of the electorate vote that their product is three or five, and the law of gravity operates with regal indifference to the preferences expressed in political party platforms. Granted, some areas of knowledge—literature, the arts, economics, for instance—are less exact than the sciences and mathematics. Yet, even there, large areas of knowledge exist which no political operation can change.

The responsibility of education in the American democracy can be met only if it is independent. To the degree that such independence is diluted, so is the unique function of education enfeebled.

It was determined that the Commission publications should present a dignified appearance, as befitted their theme and their sponsors, embellished with the best available typographical design and illustrations by distinguished artists. For the book by Charles A. Beard, I was lucky to secure on the first try the artistic services of Hendrik Willem Van Loon. *The Unique Function of Education in American Democracy* went through two complete drafts, was approved for publication in December 1936, appeared in January 1937 (just one year after the Commission's first meeting), and was an immediate and immense success. More than 40 years later, it is still quoted with respectful approval.

The Structure and Administration

The next volume in the series, on *The Structure and Administration of Education in American Democracy,* was considered by the full Commission at three meetings, approved for publication in April 1938, and published, with woodcuts by Edward Shenton, in June of that year. For the writer on this topic, the Commission had no need to look outside its own membership. Dr. George D. Strayer was superbly qualified by an extraordinary breadth of knowledge and a long career of study of the administrative procedures suitable for the conduct of a universal public school service. This book was the smallest of the five books in the series but in its 115 text pages it packed the wisdom of much accumulated experience and sagacious foresight. In these pages the Commission, with Dr. Strayer as its forceful and forthright spokesperson, declared in April 1938:

> That effectively free education requires not only free tuition but also the removal of all barriers, whether economic or social, that deny educational opportunity.
>
> That children should be organized in groups within the school when their physical, social, and intellectual maturity enables them to live and learn together.
>
> That some segregation on the basis of intellectual ability is desirable but there should be many activities in the school program in which all children should participate.
>
> That adult education should be developed as an integral part of the public school system.
>
> That local school boards should be small, unsalaried, non-partisan, and elected for relatively long terms. There should be no standing committees of the board.
>
> That teachers have a right and an obligation to contribute to the development of educational policy.
>
> That uniformity of practice within a school system is neither necessary nor desirable.
>
> That American democracy requires sympathy and understanding among all groups whatever their racial extraction or religious affiliation. Good administration therefore seeks to make sure that no practices in the public school system set one group against another or distinguish among those who are there to be prepared for citizenship in their common country.

These conclusions show the degree to which this volume, and the Commission which authorized, approved, and published it, anticipated some of today's issues in education.

Purposes: The problem

While the Commission, with the help of Dr. Beard and Dr. Strayer, was finishing *The Unique Function* and *The Structure and Administration*, we were cooking "on the back of the stove," as we put it, a third report to be entitled *The Purposes of Education in American Democracy*. The Commission's intention to publish a report on this topic had already been widely announced. But here, for the first time in its brief history so far, the Commission encountered substantial difficulties. Subcommittees were appointed but their reports were inconclusive. Philosophers, sociologists, and students of the history of education were consulted but their advice did not move in a definite direction. Two well-known writers were separately invited to submit a substantial working outline for a book on the subject. Neither of the drafts met the Commission's approval. These consultations with the Commission occurred in May, October, and November, 1936; and in January 1937.

In this desperate situation, the Commission turned to its Secretary and instructed me: (1) to use as far as possible all the previous subcommittee reports, memoranda from the specialists, and working outlines, and (2) to produce the desired document myself. I have looked up the exact date on which this thunderbolt struck me. It was on September 18, 1937, at about 3:15 in the afternoon.

My first reaction to this assignment was one of benumbed compliance. Because of the Commission's several previous but unsuccessful efforts in this area, I needed no ghost to tell me that the task would be more difficult than any other I had previously undertaken. So I consulted the oracles in the form of earlier declarations about the purposes of education. My experience as a student and teacher of the history of education served me well at this juncture. I read or re-read the views of Spencer, Plato, Loyola, Whitman, Emerson, Comenius, Quintillian, Jefferson, Dewey, Thoreau, Montaigne, Agassiz, Huxley, Whitehead, Pestalozzi, Milton, Parker, and many others who had thrown a lance at the same target as the one I had been instructed to impale. I talked with many of the nation's leading thinkers and writers. I consulted practicing teachers and school administrators because I knew that if such men and women would not consider what I wrote, the additional *imprimatur* of the Educational Policies Commission would not avail. I regret now that I did not count the numerous drafts that I tried and rejected. I do know that on April 25, 1938, the Commission voted, with enthusiasm, to approve my manuscript for publication with a few amendments suggested by various Commission members. It was ready to go to the printers, with illustrations by Boris Artzibasheff, eight months after I accepted the assignment. The first copies came from the press in September, shortly after I returned from a very pleasant and much-needed family vacation in Britain and Scandinavia. Reprints had to be ordered three months later, and again in 1939 and 1940. The last full reprint, I believe, was in 1946 but parts of it have been reprinted several millions of times–and are reprinted today.

Herbert Spencer's *Education,* written in 1860, was an early and influential effort to classify human activities as the chief basis for classifying the purposes of education. Spencer identified five major classes of human conduct:

1. Self-preservation
2. Securing the necessities of life
3. Care of offspring
4. Maintaining social and political relations
5. Gratification of tastes and feelings

Since Spencer's day scores of similar lists of activities have been made and published. At the time I was writing the report for the Policies Commission I found records of 44 such classifications defining 349 different areas of human activity. Most of these lists were interesting and useful but none of them had received national attention since the 1918 report of the NEA Commission on Reorganization of Secondary Education. That list, commonly called "the Cardinal Principles," was:

1. Health
2. Command of the fundamental processes (e.g., reading, writing, and arithmetic)
3. Home-membership
4. Vocation
5. Citizenship
6. Use of leisure
7. Ethical character

It seemed to me at the time (1937-38) the general purpose of education was the fullest possible development of each individual, always within the framework of the rapidly industrializing democratic society of the United States. I did not think then, and I do not think today, that the purpose of education includes a commitment to modify this ideal or, as it has been stated sometimes, "to build a new social order."

Purposes: The proposal

With these and many other considerations in mind, the Commission approved a four-part statement of purposes:

1. The educated person—or self-realization
2. The educated community member—or human relationships
3. The educated worker and consumer—or economic efficiency
4. The educated citizen—or civic responsibility

At this distance in time—some 40 years have elapsed—it appears to me that the "Purposes" volume served most usefully in showing both the adult citizens and professional educators that the purposes of our schools reflect and intensify the values of the society which supports them. A society which exalts force and violence will not have the same educational aims as a society which values reason, tranquillity, and justice. Again, a society which worships its ancestors and blindly reverences the past has educational purposes very different from those which guide a society which assumes the inevitability of change and adjustment. Educational purposes rest on certain ideas of what is good or bad. They are therefore an important form of social policy, a program of social action reciprocally related to an accepted scale of values.

The "Purposes" volume placed its first and heaviest emphasis on individual self-realization. It noted the constant adult pressure on the schools to shape children in the interest of their *future* occupations, their *futures* as adult citizens, their *future* roles as members of a family. The Policies Commission, however, warned that the schools, if too much preoccupied with "preparedness," might forget that a child is a growing individual human being who has certain needs quite apart from remote social preparatory activities. Every individual, we said, should be enabled and assisted to proclaim his or her own declaration of intellectual independence if only as a basis for keeping the spirit and purpose of that other Declaration of 1776.

We urged more attention in schools to oral communication, whether in private conversation or in public speaking. We urged (*in 1938*) attention to "new aspects" of mathematics. We made a sincere and respectful bow towards the "Three R's" but we also quoted with approval that "they know enough who know how to learn" (Henry Adams), and "It is better to be able neither to read nor write than it is to be able to do nothing else" (William Hazlitt). We came out strongly for the arts and said that they did not belong in the place of the poor relation but rather in a position of honor at the educational table.

We closed the chapter on self-realization with the declaration that educated persons have learned to give responsible direction to their own lives. While agreeing that the public school in the United States must avoid the inculcation of religious creeds, we also said, in what was often called the best passage in the book:

> "Yet there remain the great problems of human destiny which will always perplex, inspire and ennoble the human spirit–problems of the relation of man to that which is beyond man, of the plan, if plan there be, which directs or conditions human existence on this planet, of the meaning of human birth, life, aspiration, suffering, and death. That man is not well educated who ignores these problems. Nor is he educated who maintains an attitude of cynical indifference or of intolerant bigotry toward the efforts of others to satisfy their spiritual needs. He is educated only when he understands and appreciates the spiritual and ethical principles which constitute a central part of the heritage of the race."

Turning from the development of the individual to the connections of the individual to family, friends, and neighbors, we declared that human welfare should be at the summit of an educated person's scale of values, applicable alike to accepted tradition and proposed innovations. We called for schools to develop a scale of values which exalts human beings above money or machinery.

The educated person, the Commission said, would enjoy a rich, sincere, and varied social life. In these respects at least the proposals of the Commission anticipated much of the enthusiasm of the youthful zealots of reform in the 1960's. In other respects, however, the Commission and the youth of the flaming sixties were at odds, for the Commission firmly declared that courtesy and the amenities of polite behavior were the marks of an educated person and that the family should be respected as a basic social institution. The Commission added that both sexes should be taught to take responsibility for some or all of the tasks of homemaking and that the structure of the family would be strengthened by making needed democratic adjustments in the then-prevailing patterns of family life.

The third area of educational objectives is economic efficiency. The discussion here regretted that much education in this respect was one-sided and that production or vocation was the only phase of education which received serious attention. The Commission urged that equal attention be accorded to consumer education. We called for the exercise of informed economic responsibility by consumers, for sensible standards for expenditures, for informed and skillful buying, for teaching consumers how to safeguard their own interests through resort if necessary to legislation; and for knowledge of how to evaluate advertising.

Under the general heading of "the objectives of civic responsibility," the Commission gave first place to sensitivity to the "extraordinary range of conditions under which men live." Youth should learn, in so far as guided observation, reading, and films can enable them to do so, what it is like to be a farm laborer, to live in a slum, to rise or fall in standard of living, to survive a flood.

The Commission held that the school should build defenses against propaganda and respect for differences of opinion. It should stress the need to conserve natural resources and to recognize national interdependence. It called for education aimed at economic literacy, respect for law, the acceptance of civic duties, and, above all, loyalty to democratic ideals.

The fourth and fifth volumes in this series were then in various stages of preliminary discussion or drafting, but the three volumes already produced were sufficient to establish the Commission as the most respected voice of American education for many years.

Economic Well-being: the problem

The longest, and in some ways the most technical, volume of this series dealt with *Education and Economic Well-being in American Democracy.* Like the second volume, it was written by a member of the Commission, Dr. John Norton, with much help from his wife, Margaret. It was approved and published in 1940 with woodcuts by Lynn Ward. The authors and the Commission made a successful effort to show how expenditures for education are related to the wellbeing of a democratic society.

In those days, American teachers and school administrators might well be compared, as far as school finance is concerned, to the crew of a boat in a heavy sea who have with great exertions just steered their vessel through one almost overwhelming wave of depression and have begun to bail the salt water out of the engine room. Now they see approaching another wave of perilous size with the possibility of losing vessel, crew, and cargo.

Buildings were not the only casualties of the depression years. Up-to-date books and equipment were in very short supply. The morale of the teaching profession, although generally admirable, had been badly shaken and a few years of somewhat greater prosperity for the schools were not enough to restore the lost momentum. The schools, depression or no depression, remained caught in a gigantic pincer attack, with increased demands for services and severely limited funds crushing them from opposite sides.

Public budgets in many sectors were rising. The United States under the New Deal embarked on a series of social reforms—relief, public works, old-age security, unemployment compensation, for example. These new activities were costly and they increased the difficulty of securing public funds for the older, long-established public services such as public education. Furthermore, the war in Europe gave new urgency to expenditures for national defense, thus again adding to the difficulty of financing schools.

There was another source of danger. For many years declining birthrates and lowered immigration to this country had gradually reduced the number of children. The peak of elementary school enrollment had already been passed. The result was to place a growing proportion of the total school enrollment in the high schools and colleges and a decreasing proportion in the elementary schools. But the secondary schools and colleges provided education at a cost much greater than that of the elementary schools. The cry was raised that since the total school enrollment was declining, the cost of education should be reduced simultaneously and proportionately and it was difficult to explain the fallacy to an impatient taxpaying public.

Finally, the whole tendency of public finance in the first half of this century was to shift fiscal responsibility from local governments to the state and federal governments. State and federal taxes were easier to collect, more varied, and as a rule more equitable than local taxes. With all other major functions of government gravitating to state and federal support, the remaining functions dependent on local support were experiencing serious difficulties. Increases in state aid for education had been helpful but not massive enough to meet the situation and efforts to provide federal aid for educational finance had been almost entirely unproductive.

To meet this forbidding series of difficulties, the public schools had many sources of support. The necessity of education for the success of self-government, the recognition that basic education if neglected in childhood can rarely be regained, the inarticulate but powerful faith of Americans in their system of education, the natural concern of parents for the welfare of their children –these were all assets of powerful logic and emotional attachment.

The needed additional argument proposed by the Commission was an economic one. If the schools are not well supported, the Commission said, people will have less to spend on other things than if the schools were supported. The Commission was convinced that a powerful case for school support could be made on economic grounds alone.

But the details of this case were scattered in books on economics, public finance, and school finance. The Educational Policies Commission assembled for the first time the economic case for public education and made that case available in one comprehensive and comprehensible document. The argument for education in terms of its dollars-and-cents value is not an easy one to trace. Its mastery requires close application which busy school people are often unable to provide. They had thought of education in terms of idealism and, of course, there is no denying that the supreme values of education are not economic.

Economic Well-being: the proposal

Economists tell us that the economic well being of a country is at a maximum when barriers to the free flow of goods and services are removed. Two conditions are required in order to realize the maximum total national income. First, all persons must be sufficiently educated so that they may work in the most efficient manner. They must be provided with all the vocational knowledge and skill that they can acquire. If they acquire this amount of education, they will be able to produce the largest quantity of goods and services. Total production will be increased as a result of the larger amounts of goods and services produced by the growing number of efficient workers. More than a century of experience with a common public school system and the experience of other countries throughout the world validate this conclusion. All countries which enjoy an advanced state of economic development have extensive provisions for education. A similar relationship is found within the United States; that is, those states which are least advanced educationally are those which are falling short of capitalizing on their human and natural resources.

The second condition for realizing a maximum total income for the nation is that enough education be provided to permit people to enter callings the products of which are in demand. Workers who are threatened with low wages or unemployment because of insufficient demand for their products should be prepared for occupations where there is a demand for their products and where they may earn larger incomes. The result again will be to raise the average of individual incomes and the total national income.

The economically wise society will continue making additional amounts of education effectively free, so long as the income which accrues from increased efficiency and productivity exceeds the cost of the additional educational expenditures. There will be more left to buy other goods and services after such education is paid for than there would be if such education were not provided.

The distribution of educational opportunity in the nation is such that the potential economic effects of education are far from being fully realized. Youths condemned by an uneconomic social policy will earn less than they could have earned, and the nation's income will be less than it might have been. Wise public policy urges that this undemocratic and uneconomic situation be corrected as rapidly as possible through effectively free education.

The development of free education beyond the universal legally required minimum, considered solely from an economic point of view, should be so planned that the greatest possible increase in production will be obtained from each extension. As a general policy, therefore, facilities should first be provided so that workers may obtain training for those occupations in which they will be able to produce the largest returns for themselves and for society. The satisfaction of this principle presupposes knowledge of areas of greatest productivity. Occupational surveys of each community and region should show the points where the greatest productivity may be obtained, and consequently, the fields in which training should first be offered. Training facilities for callings already oversupplied, where wages are low and unemployment is frequent, would not be developed.

In selecting students for free education beyond the minimum, individual capacity and diligence should be predominant considerations. The objective should be to admit youths to advanced technical or professional training whenever it appears that they can fully meet the requirements of the callings involved. Bases of judgment here should be broad. Facility in memorizing and docile adjustment to academic routine will not suffice. In addition to intellectual capacity those selected should possess physical qualifications, diligence, social purpose, character, and other personal qualities appropriate to the responsibilities they must bear and the public-spirited services which society should expect from them.

Persons who might be prevented from securing the minimum amount of education deemed desirable for American citizenship, or from pursuing the advanced education for which their abilities and interests qualify them, should be given aid which will enable them to secure the proper amount of education. Provision should be made not only for tuition, but also other costs of continued education, including maintenance when necessary.

The program proposed does not contemplate the lowering of standards of admission to the schools which give professional or other occupational training. All standards of capacity, interest, health, character, and the like, which can be shown to have a valid connection with success in serving the public in a particular occupation, should be maintained at the highest possible level.

This policy is justified on the grounds that the proposed educational program in the long run will yield substantial economic returns. It will "pay for itself" since it promises to increase national income more than enough to recover the expenditures required.

Free Men

The quintet of Commission Reports on Education and American Democracy was concluded and, to some extent, synthesized in the volume entitled, *The Education of Free Men.* Written for the Commission by one of its members, Dr. George Counts, the document was first planned in 1938. It was broadened, developed, and revised in repeated drafts and discussions and approved for publication in December 1940. It was published, with illustrations by John Steuart Curry, in May 1941. These were the first years of World War II and the possibility of United States involvement in that struggle shows itself throughout the volume.

The central premise of *The Education of Free Men* may be summarized in the following condensation:

> The guarding of American democracy may require powerful armies, but if democracy is to save itself, it must establish a sound economy, put the unemployed to work, release the energies of technology, conserve the resources, and give to all a sense of security. The defense of democracy is, in the last analysis, a question of the values to be defended and applied.
>
> The American people should give as close attention to the moral quality of their educational program as the dictatorial regimes of Europe have given to theirs. They should bring their educational theory and practice into a more direct and complete harmony with the articles of the democratic faith. They should fashion an education frankly and systematically designed to give to rising generations the *loyalties*, the *knowledge*, the *discipline* of free men.

What are the *loyalties* of free men? The Commission answered that the free man is loyal to:

Himself, as a human being of dignity and worth.
The principle of human equality and brotherhood.
The process of untrammelled discussion.
The ideal of fair-mindedness and scientific spirit.
The ideal of appreciation for talent, character, and excellence in all useful work.
The obligation and the right to work
The supremacy of the common good.
The obligation to be informed and intelligent.

The *knowledge* necessary for free men includes knowledge of:

The nature of man in society.
The long struggle of mankind to civilize the human heart and mind.

The nature of the present crisis.
The weaknesses of American democracy.
The achievements of totalitarian movements.
The achievements and promise of American democracy.

Discipline is the third essential part of the education of free men. Democratic discipline requires the corrections of some deficiencies:

Misunderstanding of the nature of democracy.
Ignorance of social realities.
Indifference to the general welfare.
Weakness of common democratic loyalties.
Undemocratic practices inherited from the past.

The book had an excellent reception and distribution. It was short; it could be read at a single sitting; in fact, once begun, it was difficult to lay down.

World War II began while *Free Men* was being written. The United States itself became a combatant less than seven months after the book was published. Would the series of five major publications have been extended if the war's desolation had not intervened? I doubt it. The five volumes, considered together, had a kind of comprehensiveness. There was, come war or peace, much more work to be done by the Educational Policies Commission, but that work did not require the preparation of a sixth foundation stone. The Commission remained occupied by the continuing task of securing public attention to its five basic pronouncements as well as by the problems arising from the war and the prospects of post-war reconstruction.

5 Educational Policies Commission: War and Post-War

Distribution - War policies - Post-war education for all - Civic Education Project - Selecting the schools - Work of the field staff - Academically Talented project - The three year follow-up, with extensions - School athletics - Television as educator - Conference with TV industry leaders - The morning after - General evaluation.

The five basic documents, as well as others sponsored by the Educational Policies Commission, were issued in a variety of forms.

Distribution

The Commission gave much attention to channels for the distribution of the ideas contained in its books. Thus, for most of the books, we also wrote summaries and abstracts, articles of various length for periodicals, discussion guides for use in pre-service and in-service education courses, filmstrips with or without commentary, and recordings of interviews and panel discussions which raised the same issues as the books on which they were based.

The Education of Free Men was the only publication of the Educational Policies Commission which was promoted by a public relations firm—one of the best-known and most highly respected

PR organizations in the nation. To experiment with the possibilities of such professional promotion, the Commission was given a special grant of $5,000. The results were, in mv judgment, disappointing. I do not believe the report was more widely noticed or read or appreciated than others of the series which lacked public relations counsel.

The Commission's most unusual way of distributing its ideas took the form of a musical comedy based on *The Purposes of Education in American Democracy.* Words and original music for "On Our Way" were written by the teachers of Oakland, California. The premiere performance occured at the 1940 meeting of the School Administrators in St. Louis. The production was staged and produced by Einar Jacobsen, Superintendent of Schools in Oakland, who had had some experience in the professional theater. The show was an immedicate hit. It was subsequently produced in hundreds of high school auditoriums. We had to print the libretto and the full musical score in order to fulfill the many requests for them.

Another innovation in the distribution of ideas, but less successful, was undertaken in 1942. Travel restrictions under wartime conditions posed serious problems for groups like the Educational Policies Commission. It was desirable to communicate by voice but next to impossible to travel within shouting distance. In this situation, we tried a "Teachers' Meeting of the Air," using radio and radio tapes. We talked by radio about war-related education to audiences of teachers assembled in their own schools. I have no specific evidence on the results but I have a strong hunch that we were not very successful. There were the time zones to consider as well as the pervasive unnatural situation of a group of people listening to a disembodied voice. I have noticed that although one person can listen without difficulty to a speaker on the radio, it is very difficult for a group of people to listen passively.

So the Teachers' Meeting of the Air was given up after two tries. Had we been more inventive or more experienced in the use of the radio, the outcome might have been better. Even so, it was one more evidence of the strong desire of the Commission to get its ideas out into the arena of public debate.

The Educational Policies Commission tried to identify areas of concern as far as possible in advance of their full impact and to propose ways of dealing with them. However, as noted above, the

Commission also conducted ancillary activities to help secure attention to its pronouncements. Furthermore, on a few occasions, the Commission operated in other ways. The least known and most successful of these was the National Commission for the Public Schools—a group of citizens outside the teaching profession, which was very active in the 1950's in developing public support for public education at the local level. This National Commission, under the chairmanship of Roy Larsen, was an entirely independent body, but it came into existence as the result of the initiative of the Educational Policies Commission. The fact that the Educational Policies Commission was able to enlist the funds and time of many distinguished citizens is testimony to its own prestige.

The scope of the Commission's interest changed over the years as changing events in the United States and in the world raised new issues with new educational implications. While the five-volume series of basic documents was being issued, other important Commission enterprises were being prepared.

War policies

With the opening of World War II, but before the United States was involved, the Commission issued four short documents relevant to the concerns expressed by its consultants and others,—*Education and the War in Europe* (October 1939), *For These America's* (June 1940), *Education and the Defense of American Democracy* (July 1940), and *Education and the Morale of a Free People* (November 1941). The titles and dates of these publications show how closely the Commission was watching international developments before Pearl Harbor.

A few days after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor the Commission issued *A War Policy for American Schools.* I had, of course, been holding ready, before the "Day of Infamy," a first draft outline of this document, hoping that it would never be used. It was necessary then only to have a special meeting of the Commission to review, revise, and approve the manuscript.

Immediately after the issuance of *A War Policy,* the Commission began to plan for the post-war period in education. This forward look had at that time two major aspects. One of these was the proposed new arrangements for international relations in education. This topic will be considered in other chapters. The other aspect of post-war planning dealt with the reform and reconstruction of our own American school system.

As early as January 1942, the Commission predicted that one of the major post-war problems would be the reorganization of American secondary education, particularly at the level which serves older youth, roughly between the ages of 16 and 20. Hundreds of thousands of these young people never knew a normal civilian adult life and they served in the Armed Forces without experience in civilian employment. Their education was often cut short by their military service or by work in the war industries; yet they would be called upon as young adults to play an important role in social, economic, and political life. These new groups, as well as the oncoming generation of young people, would challenge the resourcefulness of American secondary education. The Commission, therefore, decided to issue, at some indeterminate future date, a report which would describe, in fairly concrete terms, desirable secondary school programs for each of three hypothetical but representative communities. We felt that these recommendations should be as specific as possible and should cover such practical matters as the curriculum, vocational training and work-experience, the numbers and qualifications of the school personnel required, the location, construction, and equipment of school buildings, and a plan for operating and financing the program in such a way as to preserve as much local initiative as possible.

Post-war education for all

Plans for this important post-war document were activated in November 1942. The Commission reviewed a prospectus for the document with experts in vocational education. *Education for ALL American Youth,* completed and published in 1944, was a book of 412 pages, the product of two years of study and conference. The manuscript that went to the printer in 1944 was the *ninth* complete revision of the original draft. Over a hundred educators and other citizens, from Boston to Los Angeles, cooperated with the Commission and its staff in its production.

The Commission tried to produce a readable book to appeal to concerned citizens as well as to school people. The heart of the book was three chapters which described in some detail the secondary schools of "Farmville" and "American City" and the youth education program of "Columbia," the mythical state in which

81

Farmville and American City were located. These school systems are described as though the reader were actually observing them five years after World War II ended.

I feel that the volume did succeed in making these programs vivid and realistic. The reader became acquainted with Myron Evans, principal of the Farmville school, and with many members of his staff. Through the pages of the book, one attended staff conferences, teachers' committee meetings, and sessions of the Community Council. One met many of the students, visited their classes, their school shops, their recreation areas. Selected articles and headlines from the weekly *Farmville Enterprise* were provided. Difficulties encountered in making the desired changes were described, as well as the manner in which these barriers were surmounted or circumvented. Parallel material was provided for American City and Columbia.

Of course, these were not *real* schools but they were, we felt, *possible* schools and should not be dismissed as utopian dreams. Few if any of the practices suggested could not be found at that time in some real school somewhere in the United States. *Education for ALL American Youth* was intended to be idealistic in its totality, but pragmatic and eclectic in its component parts.

The Commission tried to disabuse the minds of readers of the idea that its book was a kind of blueprint or universal prescription. The Commission was saying in substance: "State and local authorities should begin at once to plan for post-war changes in secondary education. Here are a few examples of the kind of planning that should take place and the kinds of programs that might result from such planning. Into these examples we have put the best of our thought and experience. We offer these examples in the hope that they will help you to plan your own programs for your own community. The Commission will be disappointed if you look upon this volume as a set of blueprints to be copied."

This was a noble gesture but the Commission and its staff should have known better. Whatever may be said to the contrary, I think I have learned that human nature generally calls for working blueprints rather than for a long-range, long-term task of hard, independent thinking.

The Commission did provide a body of principles from which the concrete examples of Farmville and the rest could be derived:

–That the post-war economic and social scene would require participation by all American youth in educational experiences to at least the 18th birthday;

–That the voting age be lowered from 21 to 18; (This recommendation was nationally implemented by a Constitutional Amendment some quarter-century later.)

–That "educational experiences for all to age 18" does not and should not mean compulsory uniform full-time school attendance to 18;

–That tertiary education should be universally available to follow secondary education; the institutions providing such services could be called junior colleges or institutes of applied arts and sciences, or any other convenient term; (The Commission itself used the term "community institutes.")

–That the schools must organize opportunities for gainful employment in private industry and student work programs and/or scholarships financed by public funds;

–That supervised experience in productive work should be regarded as a normal part of the education of youth;

–That American youth have many needs in common which should be met by a program of "common learnings" for all, without exception;

–That American youth, taken one at a time, have many needs which are unique and these needs should be met by differentiated learning opportunities;

–That the emphasis by the Commission on *All* American youth was intended to mean exactly what it says. All American youth, with their human similarities and equally human differences, should have educational opportunities which are suited to their personal needs and sufficient for the successful operation of a free and democratic society.

A further report entitled, *Education for ALL American Children* followed in 1948 but it did not have the impact of the volume on Youth. The Commission later expanded the series to include shorter reports on Nursery School-Kindergarten services and on the Junior College level of education.

As the years went by, the support of the Commission from Foundation sources was slowly diminished and the contributions from the two sponsoring organizations, (the National Education Association and the American Association of School Administrators) were correspondingly increased. However, even after the full expense of the Commission's regular operation was assumed by the sponsors, special grants from Foundation sources were occasionally secured to enable the Commission to carry out certain special projects. Two of these, at least, deserve special notice.

Civic Education Project

The Civic Education Project began at a meeting in November 1938, when the Educational Policies Commission voted "to recognize the improvement of civic education as a major commitment." The basic purpose was to improve the effectiveness with which American schools develop among youth an intelligent and appreciative loyalty to democracy.

The method of work in the project involved first the indentification of the essential ideals of democratic life and at least some of the features which appear to characterize good civic education. Most of the theoretical groundwork on these topics had been provided by the American Democracy series,–and especially by the chapter on Civic Responsibility in *The Purposes of Education in American Democracy.*

The second step was to bring together all of the currently available tools for estimating the success of a civic education program. This step proved rather unproductive and the Commission's final report contained as its closing chapter a new schedule to assist in the evaluation of a school or school system in this respect.

Selecting the schools

The third step was to select 90 unusually effective secondary schools located in 27 states to be visited during the next phase of the program. The selection of the schools for the field study was not easy. We asked the 3,000 Commission consultants for advice on the names and locations of secondary schools with exceptionally effective programs in some phase of citizenship education. The consultants were asked not only to name the schools but to specify the areas of civic education in which each school was thought to excel. The areas included, which also constituted the major chapters of the final report, were:

1. The course of study
2. Teaching methods

3. Extra-curricular activities
4. School and community relations
5. Administration
6. Evaluation of outcomes.

A few nationally known schools were named by many consultants but still the first list contained the names of 1,300 schools.

A list of all schools named within each state was then sent to a group of people in that state whom we believed to be particularly well-informed about civic education. Thus, further advice on these schools was accumulated. In making the final selection we sought to include examples of the widest possible variety. The final list includes some very small rural high schools, one large consolidated rural school, suburban schools, schools in large cities, schools in industrial centers, schools in underprivileged areas, schools attended wholly or predominately by minority groups, private high schools, six-year high schools, junior and senior comprehensive schools, vocational high schools, and junior colleges. All geographic regions of the country were represented.

Every one of the schools selected for field study gladly agreed to our request to allow us to visit and examine them. We enjoyed, without exception, every support by the teachers and administrators involved, even when considerable outlays of their time and difficult administrative adjustments were required.

Work of the field staff

There were five field workers beside myself. It was, I believe, the most competent group ever assembled for any NEA-related project. Our field observations constituted the fourth step, occupying five months beginning in September 1939.

Extensive field notes were made by each of us according to a uniform plan previously developed and adopted by the staff. The use of the same plan of observation made it easy for the field notes by any one staff member to be used by any other staff member. A few schools, especially in the beginning phases of the field work, were visited by the entire team. Most of the schools were visited by two or three staff members and a few were visited by only one person. The field study brought to light many innovations and promising procedures. It had also important further psychological advantages. It kept the staff in close touch with reality. And it made the recommendations more acceptable because it was possible to say that a given procedure in civic education was workable because it had actually been seen in successful operation.

Before visiting a school we gathered and read and made full notes on every available bit of published material on the schools. We knew the school well (on paper) before we saw it in reality.

Although each of the six field staff members was specialized to some degree in one of the six areas of civic education already listed, all of us visited and took notes on every aspect of the program of education for citizenship. We always emphasized that we were not looking for weaknesses or failures; we were looking for success stories. Every field staff member, as a matter of highest priority, visited a considerable number of classes in operation,-- and these classes were by no means limited to those listed as "social studies."

We made particular efforts to consult with the young people themselves. We scanned recent copies of the student newspaper. We asked 1,500 high school students to write, for our use only, and in 15 minutes, a statement on the topic, "What Democracy Means to Me." The question was asked without warning and the papers were collected by the Commission field worker on the spot to avoid any possibility of coaching or "second thoughts." We found that these young people were often thinking in negative terms,–democracy is what they do not have in dictatorships. Another substantial group responded largely in well-worn slogans, such as, "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" or "of the people, by the people, and for the people" or even "Democracy means to me equality, liberty and eternity"!

In addition to slogans and negative definitions, we encountered many serious efforts to define democracy. However, nearly all students emphasized the privileges of democracy. Few mentioned its duties.

The final phase of the Project was the drafting of the report and its thorough review by the Commission. It was approved for publication at the Commission meeting on May 13, 1940. The impact of the report was unusually strong, probably because of its emphasis on practical and proven workability. I believe it helped to change American education for the better –and not only civic education. It was featured in LIFE magazine (January 13, 1941), discussed (May 1, 1941) on America's Town Meeting of the Air, as well as on many other less prestigious programs, and was the subject of some 35 regional conferences involving both school people and lay citizens.

In addition, at the request of the National Committee on Education and Defense, and in cooperation with personnel from eight city school systems, the Commission staff prepared and published six pamphlets of teaching materials about national defense and suggestions for their use in the schools.

Academically Talented project

A second special project for which the Educational Policies Commission received additional funds dealt with the education of gifted children. The topic had been discussed, in passing or by inference, in many of the Commission's policy statements. However, no explicit consideration of the topic was undertaken. Dr. James B. Conant, then President of Harvard University, was the Commission member who most regularly insisted that the gifted members of the school population constituted a minority whose legitimate needs were too largely neglected. In October 1949, the Commission authorized the preparation of a statement of policy on the education of the gifted. The final draft was approved for publication by the Commission after a three-day session on March 31, 1950, at the same meeting at which Dr. Conant was elected to a term as Chairman of the Commission.

Those who remember the furor in the United States in 1957 when the Soviet Union successfully launched Sputnik, the first earth satellite, and in particular the demands on the schools to improve their instruction of gifted pupils, particularly in science and mathematics, may take some satisfaction, as I do, in noting that the organized teaching profession through the Educational Policies Commission and its sponsoring agencies recognized the importance of the education of the gifted seven years before the launching of Sputnik with its consequent wave of nearly hysterical concern.

The intense interest in certain aspects of education which followed the Russian success (and, for a few months, the American lack of success) in this area, made it possible to continue to build on the work that was performed in 1950 and to secure support for it, both from the National Education Association and from other sources. Sputnik was placed in orbit on October 1957. In February 1958, a group of 200 concerned educators met for a three-day conference on the education of the gifted under the chairmanship of Dr. James B. Conant. The Conference Report was published by the National Education Association and sent to every superintendent of schools in the nation. The response was favorable. Three printings of 10,000 copies each were required.

The three year follow-up, with extensions

The public and professional interest led to the inauguration of a three-year project on the Academically Talented Pupil in the Secondary School, with additional funds from the National Education Association and the Carnegie Corporation. This project, formally lauched in August 1958, had three basic functions: a clearing house; consultative service to school systems; and conferences and publications.

All of the publications were the results of conferences with the major organizations in each of the curriculum areas. A typical procedure involved a three-day consultation with about 30 experts nominated by a representative organization. For example, for the report on the teaching of foreign languages for the gifted, the Modern Language Association supplied the expert assistance. From these conferences issued a series of 15 publications, each covering some special field of educational activity or curriculum. During the project some 345,000 copies were distributed. Although the project was originally set up for only three years, in 1960 a survey of progress indicated that attention to the Academically Talented Child was still lagging severely, especially in the big cities. The Carnegie Corporation, therefore, extended the funding of the project to 1962 so as to provide concentrated assistance in the urban areas. The assistance took the form of more extended visits, some lasting up to four weeks in a single city, by project representatives. Sixty large cities and 20,000 individual teachers were contacted in this way. From 1963 to 1966 the project was continued on the income from sales of its publications and by appropriations from the National Education Association. However, in 1966, the Carnegie Corporation added some funds to provide a newsletter to be sent without cost to all 85,000 high schools in the United States. This newsletter, accenting the importance of continued attention to the education of the academically talented pupil, was issued twice a year for two years. The project formally ended in May 1968.

The relative neglect of the academically talented youth in American secondary schools, the Commission concluded, was due to a combination of several factors. First, the American people on the whole have strong egalitarian views and thus fail to see the need for extremely able and well-educated leaders. Second, the generally low level of financial support adversely affects the education of the talented just as it injures the education of others. Third, academic talent is largely invisible; it is not as easily evident as, for example, the strength and height of a talented basketball player, or the performance of a talented musician or singer. Thus, too little attention is given to identifying the academically talented, to counselling them, or to making special provisions for their education.

I remember that, during the active stages of the Commission's project on the education of the gifted, I happened to visit a school which employed, full-time, three teachers, a principal, and a caretaker. It enrolled only 32 children. The entire staff was highly trained. The teaching equipment was abundant, maintained in first-class condition, and skillfully used. It was a public school for children of severely retarded mental development.

No one could wish to deprive these children of the care, affection, and skilled individual attention that each of them received. But an approximation of these almost ideal learning conditions, if made available to some of the nation's most highly talented youth, might yield social dividends of incalculable value.

School athletics

I must not leave the impression that every activity and publication of the Educational Policies Commission was received with universal acclaim or produced immediate and visible changes. Several efforts by the Commission showed clearly that it was dealing with an issue whose time had not come –and perhaps never would come. I will give two examples. The first example is provided by the Commission's effort to put interscholastic athletics in its proper place.

In July 1951, the Commission first announced that it was preparing to issue a report and recommendations on high school athletics. Few topics among the Commission's many enterprises were handled more gently. It was more than a year later, in October 1952, that the Commission authorized the employment of writers to prepare the first draft. J. B. Edmonson, a former member of the Commission, was selected to coordinate the effort. He developed a draft which was reviewed with representatives of the American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation (AAHPER) in November 1952. By March 1953, a draft was ready for Commission review. It was then referred to a subcommittee for further study and revision. The subcommittee reported to the Commission in October 1953, at which time still further revisions were suggested. It was not until December 1953, that the Commission voted,–unanimously at last,–to publish the report. The report went through three printings between February 1954 and July 1960.

The Commission's opinion was that athletics serve valuable purposes in school programs but that too much of their educational potential is unused or misused. In listing changes that were needed in school athletics, the Commission was indicating, by inference, certain areas of school sports programs which served purposes inconsistent with desirable educational objectives. Among these conclusions were the following:

–Schools should provide athletic participation for every student;

–Organized games and sports should be conducted by teachers on the regular school staff and under the control of the school administration;

–School athletics should offer varied opportunities and be scheduled to permit maximum student participation;

–No interscholastic athletic competition in elementary or junior high schools;

–No post-season championship games or tournaments;

–High pressure competition which subordinates fun and good sportsmanship to victory should not be permitted;

–Competition conducted outside the jurisdiction of the school should not be encouraged or assisted by school personnel and such personnel have a responsibility to help bring about better public understanding of desirable athletic experience;

–Pressures from out-of-school promoters, recruiters for higher institutions, and parents who seek athletic stardom for their children should be resisted by school personnel;

–Boxing is not a suitable sport for schools at any level;

–Body contact sports (e.g., ice hockey or tackle football) should be limited to senior high school boys;

–In the elementary school and to some extent in junior high schools, co-recreation play should be the general rule;

–Girls should share equally with boys in funds, staff, equipment, and facilities for athletics (N.B.: in 1953!);

–Interscholastic athletics should be governed by the same authorities who control other aspects of the local school program. State high school athletic associations should function in accordance with the policies of the state educational agency;

–School boards should insist that the program of interscholastic athletics is not dependent on gate receipts;

–Funds and staff provided for athletics should not be at the expense of other essential educational goals.

The reaction in some quarters to these recommendations was explosive. While the rank and file of teachers welcomed them, many of the specialists and administrators in school athletics were appalled. The sports writers ridiculed the recommendations or treated them with silent contempt. It was even proposed in the NEA Board of Directors that the Commission be advised to keep its hands out of the school athletic issues or be disowned and left with reduced financial support. This threat, I am glad to add, was never made effective by any action of the Board and it had no effect on the Commission's continued distribution and promotion of its recommendations.

Television as educator

In 1948, during the annual meeting of the Representative Assembly of the National Education Association, a study group recommended that the NEA develop ways of improving the teaching of moral and spiritual values. Thereupon the NEA Executive Committee asked the Educational Policies Commission to study the problem and to submit a report.

The Commission proceeded at once to have a number of documents prepared to help in clarifying the issues and in determining the recommendations. These documents included a survey of the resources available in public schools for moral and spiritual education, an annotated bibliography, a group of statements representing various points of view on the sources of moral and spiritual values, and several alternative outlines of the subject. During its work on this matter, the Commission as usual conferred with practicing teachers, school administrators, and experts in related fields. The report, in various stages of development, was considered at four successive meetings of the Commission and was approved for publication by a mail ballot in December 1950. It was published in 1951.

Few, if any, reports of the Commission were as extensively debated for as long a period of time as this one. In general it was well received and I believe it helped to encourage among the general public, as well as in the schools themselves, a rebirth of interest in education for moral and spiritual values within a public school system from which religious and sectarian sanctions are excluded.

At a meeting of the Commission in Washington in the spring of 1950 I had included in the draft report a brief notice of the powerful forces in the community, other than the schools, which may either contribute to the efforts of the schools or seriously hamper them. A member of the Commission noted that nothing specific was said about the possible good or evil effects of exposure to the motion pictures, television, and radio. Another member of the Commission declared that the quality of children's television programs was poor.

At this point, Mr. Eisenhower remarked that he had a good television set in his new home, the President's house at Columbia University, and that a number of youngsters came to his home to watch television in the late afternoon. He had been shocked, he said, by the character of what was shown and remarked, half facetiously, that unless at least three people are killed in the first ten minutes, the children turn to another channel. Mr. Eisenhower said the Commission should evaluate the impact on moral and spiritual values of motion pictures and television. People in education, he said, are talked to all the time about our great responsibilities. It is high time that we say in response, "Okay, we'll do our best but you other guys ought to get busy too."

After some further discussion Mr. Eisenhower inquired whether the Commission ever invited other people to meet with it. At that point the Commission voted unanimously that such a meeting be held with representatives of the television industry. Mr. Eisenhower offered to make some telephone calls or sign letters to the end that the top policy making people in the television industry would attend the meeting. This proposal was gladly accepted.

Conference with TV industry leaders

The meeting itself was held at the Westchester Country Club in Rye, New York, in a long afternoon session on October 6, 1950. Unfortunately for the Commission, after the invitations had been sent and acceptances received, the trustees of Johns Hopkins University announced that the inauguration of Milton Eisenhower as President of the University would occur on that day. Thus Dwight D. Eisenhower who, as a member of the Commission, had given the most impetus to a discussion of television, was unable to attend the meeting. This was one of the very few times that Mr. Eisenhower failed to participate vigorously in a Commission meeting. We missed him, but everyone agreed that the inauguration of his brother was a compelling reason for his absence.

Each of the networks, as well as the National Association of Broadcasters, was represented by high ranking officials. They comprised a group of approximately a dozen visitors.

I reminded the group that the Educational Policies Commission was concerned about the effects, whether positive or negative, which home television may have on the moral and spiritual education of children and that the Commission was then writing a report on moral and spiritual values. The first response of the group from television was that the effects of television on children are unknown. Nor had research given a clear indication of whether those effects are likely to persist. Another guest said that the effects of TV would not be the same on a nine-year-old child who had just obtained a television set at home as they would be on a child who had grown up with TV. As he examined the history of radio in the home, it seemed to him probable that familiarity leads in the long run to selectivity. Another spokesman for television said that he was not at all sure that TV deeply changes a child's attitudes or tastes. If a child spends many hours watching television on a clear pleasant day, there is something wrong with his neighborhood and its recreational facilities and not necessarily anything wrong with the television. A series of other exculpatory statements by the TV representatives followed.

At this point I interposed to try to get the discussion back on the track. I pointed out that the Educational Policies Commission was not concerned with praise or with blame. It was seeking to discover how to improve the situation. We do not deny, I said, the need for parental supervision in the use of home television. The Commission was looking for a way to make the content of the material presented over home television contribute to the objectives of the school system.

At that point, one of the representatives of the television industry asked how many of the members of the Educational Policies Commission actually saw television regularly or frequently. It turned out that only four members of the Commission had receiv[illegible] their own homes or had ready access to receivers elsewhere.

That fact, said the television representatives, indicates the advisability of a description for you of some of the excellent programs on the air so we can have some basis for discussion.

A member of the Commission, however, said that other interpretations could be made of the lack of television sets in the homes of many Commission members. As far as he was personally concerned, he said, "I do not have a television set in my home. We have two children. There will be no set in my home as long as the present programs are in operation. I have enough trouble with radio, to put it bluntly."

At this point in the confrontation, the television representatives seemed to be willing to rest their case on the grounds that members of the Commission were really not familiar at first hand with what appears on television. One of the television representatives said that the most important word in our discussion was "selectivity." She suggested that the Educational Policies Commission assist parents and teachers, more than broadcasters at this moment, to help make the American child an informed critic of TV material. The television industry must provide material to which children would willingly listen. If the schools did not elevate the taste and selectivity of the children, educators could only expect that television would have to let its programming fall to the level which the schools' indifference had created.

This ingenious turn of the debate was followed immediately by another representative of the industry who said that it was always discouraging to remove excellent programs because too few people would listen to them. He spoke of a series in which his company had made a substantial investment and which had been dropped after a year's experimentation because there was no audience of adequate size to support it. What the television industry needed more than criticism, he said, was help and encouragement. Just as a matter of human relations it would be better to avoid the sweeping condemnations of television which he felt were typical reactions of educational groups. When a man sets out to woo a maid, he said, he doesn't ordinarily tell her, "if you would only cut your hair shorter and stop wearing glasses, I would be delighted to marry you." Television is not likely to team up with organized education as long as a steady stream of hostile criticism is directed by the school system toward the television effort. Besides, he said, in the long run and in general, television is not going to be a self-conscious effort to educate. Television is basically an art form and an information form. To twist its basic nature, to make it into a classroom would be fatal both to television and to the educational effort. He suggested as a practical matter that it might be advisable to set up some kind of joint complaint center composed of educators, parents, and broadcasters to which complaints could be directed whatever the nature or source of the criticism.

The morning after

The next morning the Commission met again. It seemed to be generally agreed that the Commission's position vis-a-vis the visitors had been weak because so many members of the Commission had not themselves examined television programs. The question of a separate report on television in the home was referred to the steering committee from which it never again emerged.

In the ultimate text of the report on *Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools,* the final chapter was entitled, "Partners." Here the Commission said that the personnel of the public schools may become more than a little weary of being expected to carry practically the whole of education in moral and spiritual areas whilst they are taunted as "godless" and ineffective if they do not overcome the powerful mal-educative forces which are permitted to flourish in almost every community. If homes, churches, business interests, and community agencies would equal the schools in insistent, skilled, and intensive effort to teach the good life, substantial improvement in the moral and spiritual values of American youth could be expected. In a paragraph headed, "New Means of Communication Influence the Values of Children," the Commission pointed out that the press, radio, television and motion pictures have multiplied the means of communicating ideas, good and bad, that these media have broken down regional isolation and provided many cultural opportunities as well as stimulating public interest in public affairs. On the other hand, said the Commission, the communications industries have not been uniformly sensitive to moral implications of their work. Referring to television as "a growing giant in the field of mass communications," the Commission pointed out that many children spend as much time watching television as they spend in the school room. The Commission criticised those programs comprising only "pointless chatter, the excessive commerical emphasis, the dramatization of crimes which leaves little to the imagination, and dramas which depict the most sordid aspects of human behavior" as detrimental to the moral and spiritual values which the schools are trying to develop. It also recognized that some television programs provide wholesome amusement and effective education.

It is of interest to note that when the meetings just described were held (1950) less than one household in ten had a television receiving set. *Only ten years later* (1960), the figures were reversed and more than nine-tenths of American households had at least one TV set.

Thus the Educational Policies Commission which missed the opportunity to make a full and constructive proposal on the educational effects of television in the home, at least saw the potentialities clearly enough to devote some time to exploring the area.

In January 1965 a report by the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television proposed the establishment of a Corporation for Public TV. On the same day I issued a statement as Executive Secretary of the NEA endorsing the Carnegie proposal. I pointed out that educational television had severely constricted financial resources and that the funds for a whole year of educational television amounted roughly to what commercial TV spent in a single week. I called for prompt Congressional action on the Carnegie proposals. The present Public Broadcasting System had its origins in the Carnegie report.

General evaluation

In his Centennial (1957) History of the National Education Association, Dr. Edgar B. Wesley describes the Educational Policies Commission itself as "an instant success," its early publications as "timely and influential," and its continued achievements as the outcome of "sound analysis of educational issues and a strategic sense of timing and feasibility."

The appraisal of the Commission that I value most highly, however, was made in 1950 by Dr. Edmund E. Day, President of Cornell University, and President of the General Education Board at the time the Board decided to break with its past and provide funds for the establishment and support of the Educational Policies Commission. For the first five years, 1937-1942, Dr. Day attended almost all meetings of the Commission and in 1950 was especially invited to attend the Thirty-Sixth Meeting. Toward the end of this meeting Dr. Day said:

> I have long regarded this Commission as offering the best opportunity I have ever known to get a free exchange of ideas at a very high level of understanding and intelligence. . . . It has done great work and I am sure that the General Education Board never invested speculative money to any better advantage than when it backed this Commission."

Such a comment, coming from the head of a foundation which had spent some $316 million in an extremely wide variety of efforts to improve education is a most flattering encomium.

The exact number of reports produced by the Educational Policies Commission is difficult, at this date, to determine. It is recorded that in its first sixteen years, 1937 to 1953, the Commission produced 80 reports. The output by volume was slightly smaller in the final 16 years. The total output was about 150 statements during the entire life of the Commission (1937-1967).

The work of the Educational Policies Commission on post-war planning had two phases: national and international. Having summarized the former, we now turn for an account of some international aspects of post-war planning.

6 The United Nations and UNESCO

Liaison Committee–San Francisco–Breakthrough–In summary–UNESCO begins in London–The cold peace–"In the minds of men"–The vacant chair–Homeward bound–Direct or indirect promotion–The first time I saw Paris–Mexico City and after–Turning-point in a long road.

During the last years of World War II, an increasing determination developed among educators that the power of their profession should be enlisted to help deal constructively with international problems. Informal discussions began during 1942, centering around three kinds of problems:

1. How to prevent the further misuse of education as an instrument of deceit.
2. How to restore educational services in areas of heavy war damage. Universities had been destroyed, libraries burned, schools damaged, the schooling of an entire generation interrupted and distorted.
3. How to relate the organization of education to international cooperation.

In 1943, two small books on post-war education were published, one in the United States and one in Great Britain. The American report was issued by the Educational Policies Commission. The British report was issued by the Council on Citizenship. As the author of the former, I am sure that there was no collaboration or exchange of ideas between those who drafted them, yet the two were closely parallel.

The Educational Policies Commission document, entitled *Education and the People's Peace,* became a primary topic of conversation among teachers, school administrators, and members of the public. Special editions were prepared for various segments of the public. A substantial campaign, financed by the War and Peace Fund of the National Education Association, was launched to secure full public consideration of the recommendations.

A considerable number of existing organizations, and some newly-established agencies became involved in the same general cause. The interest in international cooperation among civic and scholarly groups became so intense and diverse that the American Academy of Political and Social Science invited me to edit the September 1944 issue of *The Annals* of the Academy upon this topic. I had little difficulty in locating contributors on the assigned topic.

Liaison Committee

Another example of our work is provided by the Liaison Committee on International Education. Organized in 1943 by Grayson Kefauver, then on leave from his post as Dean of the School of Education at Stanford University, and conducted by me in 1944-45, after Dr. Kefauver was assigned to London by the State Department, the Liaision Committee held three International Educational Assemblies. The first Assembly, meeting at Harper's Ferry, West Virginia, in September 1943, brought together participants from twenty-six countries. These were not delegates of governments; they were men and women of distinction in the educational circles of their respective countries. The first Assembly published a report which proposed *inter alia* a permanent post-war international organization for education and cultural exchange and a temporary agency to deal with immediate post-war educational issues.

The second Assembly met at Hood College, Frederick, Maryland, in June 1944, with participants from thirty countries. My central aim was to formulate a statement describing "Education in a Free Society." I believe that it was the first such effort *on an inter-*

102

national basis in history. I recall that D-Day, the invasion of German-occupied Western Europe, occurred during this meeting and that the news and the eloquent prayer offered by President Roosevelt made the Assembly more aware than ever of the immense importance of the topics under discussion. The Hood College meeting also urged the prompt establishment of an international organization to promote educational relations throughout the world.

Less than a year later, in April 1945, I called the third and final meeting of the International Education Assembly in New York City. By that time the number of countries from which participants came was thirty-four. The Assembly had now become well enough known so that funds and other forms of help and hospitality were generously provided by the China Institute in America, the New York Public Library, the National Broadcasting Company, and other sources.

It was by then publicly known that (1) the international meeting to draft the United Nations Charter would begin in San Francisco in a few weeks, and (2) the draft United Nations Charter (then known as the "Dumbarton Oaks Draft") with which the San Francisco Conference would start its work had carefully avoided the least reference, direct or indirect, to the question of international cooperation in education.

As the major world event at our 1944 Assembly was the D-Day invasion, so the shattering news of the sudden death of President Franklin D. Roosevelt gave a somber tone to the 1945 Assembly. The participants from countries other than the United States organized a private session at which they adopted a resolution of respect and condolence.

The uncertainty created by change in the Presidency did not modify the basic policy of the Assembly. Our final official act before we adjourned *sine die* was to send to delegates who would soon assemble in San Francisco a strong recommendation for an international Office of Education to be a clearinghouse and advisory center for educational activities especially with regard to fostering international understanding.

Many members of the Assembly sent this resolution to the San Francisco delegates of their respective countries. In more generalized distribution we had excellent cooperation from the radio and the newspapers. Three of us appeared briefly on the still experimental television broadcast of NBC. It was my first experience with this medium of communication and a very trying one. The studio lights were blinding and we were anointed with a make-up to protect our faces against the blistering heat those lights generated.

San Francisco

Less than a month after the New York Assembly I was on my way to San Francisco as part of the United States Delegation to the United Nations Conference on International Organization.

Many people then—as still a few people do today—erroneously thought of the San Francisco meeting as a Peace Conference. It was, however, a constitutional convention, an effort to draft the working rules of an international organization to shield humankind from the scourge of war. As such it was the final step in a long series which included: the Atlantic Charter issued by Churchill and Roosevelt in 1942; the Moscow Declaration of the United Nations in 1943; the Act of Chapultepec issued by the nations of the Western Hemisphere; the summit meetings at Yalta, Cairo, and Teheran; the establishment of special international agencies for food and agriculture, relief and rehabilitation in 1943; and, most important, the Conference at Dumbarton Oaks to which reference has just been made.

The San Francisco Conference was certainly the most important political event with which I have been personally associated. It constituted a small city within the city of San Francisco. The elite center of its population consisted of the approximately 1,700 delegates and their alternates, advisors, and consultants. About 1,000 multilingual typists worked in shifts to keep the delegations equipped with the basic documentation. In addition, a staff of 120 professional interpreters was employed to work in the five official Conference languages. Every day the Secretariat issued about half a million impression-pages of documents. The 96 amendments, submitted by one or more of the national delegations, for the revision of the Dumbarton Oaks working paper, required over 400 pages. The delegations wore out, or chewed up, or walked away with 20,000 pencils. They used 600 bottles of ink and 3,000 erasers. There were more than 60 standing or temporary drafting committees which held a total of 335 meetings. Transportation for Conference personnel within the city required 290 cars and buses—and three ambulances.

The consultants in the United States Delegation at San Francisco were named by 42 national organizations of which the National Education Association was one. Secretary of State Edward Stettinius, the head of the United States Delegation to the Conference, told the consultants on the second day of the Conference that he would be accessible to us at all times. His conduct during the Conference reflected his policy to regard the consultants within the United States Delegation as "an experiment in taking the people through their unofficial representatives into the process of making foreign policy."

From the opening sessions to the concluding ceremony of signatures, the San Francisco Conference gave steadily increasing recognition to economic and social forces, including education.

There was little original interest among the delegates of the great powers. True, the Delegation of China on the very first day of the Conference issued a formal proposal that the Charter should "specifically provide for the promotion of educational and other forms of cultural cooperation." In the opening round of the "general debate," however, education was ignored by the Delegations of the United Kingdom, the United States, France, and the Soviet Union.

On April 28, educational cooperation was mentioned for the first time in a plenary session of the Conference. The representative from Lebanon said, "Educational and intellectual cooperation among the nations is of primary importance." The spokesman for Uruguay on the same day called for the establishment of an international council on education. Similar points were made during the opening general discussion by delegations from Ecuador, Greece, Norway, Panama, Philippines, Iran, and Haiti.

Thus, during the early days of the Conference, only the small nations emphasized the economic, social, and educational functions of the new organization whose Charter we were writing. These delegations perhaps knew they could not function powerfully in military and economic matters, but that in educational and cultural matters they might be regarded as substantially equal.

On May 1, at a meeting with other members of the United States Delegation, I had an opportunity to introduce into the discussion the results of the public opinion poll on international cooperation in education which the National Education Association (again with the resources of its War and Peace Fund) had conducted. This poll showed that approximately 84 percent of the

American people responded affirmatively to the suggestion that there should be a world agency for education.

The difficulty in securing a Charter reference to education centered around four points:

First, that reference to international educational cooperation would make it more difficult to secure ratification of the Charter by the United States Senate. There was at San Francisco continued and genuine apprehension that the United Nations Charter, in seeking the advice and consent of the Senate, might encounter the same fate as the League of Nations Covenant;

Second, there was the opinion put forward by Delegate John Foster Dulles (later the United States Secretary of State) that the word "cultural" was less likely to raise objections and adequately covered what we had in mind (or, at least, what we ought to have in mind);

Third, the pressure of time made it difficult to secure attention to any topic that was not in the early draft of the Charter prepared at Dumbarton Oaks;

Finally, there was doubt as to whether the public really cared much, one way or the other, about international cooperation in education.

I made a variety of arrangements to make sure that the United States Delegation heard from the educational community of the United States and from others interested in education on these points. This was the time when all of our preparatory work would either pay off or be proven ineffective. It paid off.

May 4, 1945, had been set as the deadline for submitting amendments to the Dumbarton Oaks Draft. At midnight, just under the deadline, the joint proposals of the United States, China, Great Britain, and Russia were filed. They contained no reference to education.

One of the Amendments proposed jointly by the "Big Four" was the suggestion of a new chapter of the Charter to create a Trusteeship Council to deal with those parts of the world which were then in colonial status. The draft as submitted contained no reference to the importance of education as a means of preparing the people of these areas for independence or self-government. I began immediately to endeavor to get this point covered in the next revision. The best test of the good faith of a trustee nation, I argued, would be its educational policy towards the inhabitants of the trust territory. A trustee could provide food, clothing, and health services without preparing the recipients for self-government. To enable the colonized areas of the world to compress centuries of experience into years or decades it was essential to provide education, and not merely the skills of literacy. Changes reflecting this point of view were included in the Trusteeship Chapters of the United Nations Charter at San Francisco.

Meanwhile, I was constantly in touch with the NEA staff in Washington. There we arranged for Senators J. William Fulbright and Robert Taft to sponsor a resolution in the Senate favoring the participation of the United States in an international office of education and cultural development. Sponsorship of this resolution by two such influential senators, one from each of the two political parties, was a major advantage. A similar resolution was introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman (later Senator) Karl Mundt. In New York, a month earlier, Congressman Mundt had been the keynote speaker before the International Education Assembly.

In San Francisco, the consultants met every day with key members of the United States Delegation. It was our function to discover and interpret the interests of various segments of the American people to other members of our Delegation. On the question of educational cooperation we formed an informal group among the consultants representing Agriculture, Business, Labor, and Education. This group was popularly referred to as the ABLE group. (The representative of the National Council of Churches remarked to me later that if Religion had been included, the ABLE group would have been ABLER. I think he was right.)

Breakthrough

On the evening of May 12, as a panel member on an NBC hookup, I had an excellent opportunity to bring the question of international cooperation in education to a considerable segment of public opinion. During the discussion I was invited by Assistant Secretary of State Archibald MacLeish to "state the case" for educational cooperation. I asked Delegate Virginia Gildersleeve why the United States Delegation had failed to support the Chinese proposal to sponsor "educational and other forms of cultural cooperation" and had deleted the specific reference to education. Dean Gildersleeve said that "education" to some people may have connotations of propaganda.

107

> *Carr*: Well, of course, some dictionary definitions for education do mention propaganda. But some dictionary definitions of culture mention bacteria. After all, a recent public opinion poll showed that 84 percent of the American people wanted an international agency *for education*. Is there any other issue on which you could get such nearly universal approval?
>
> *Dean Gildersleeve:* I don't know of any, Dr. Carr.
>
> *Carr*: What then accounts for the fear of the word "education"?
>
> *Dean Gildersleeve*: I suppose it springs from a variety of things. . . .Some people object to what they see as possible "interference" with our American system of education by foreign countries. . . .I don't share this viewpoint. But apparently it does exist. We might ask Mr. MacLeish to define "culture."

9

Mr. MacLeish caught the lateral pass dexterously and ran with it. "Culture," he said, "is one of the things you can't define. . . .you describe it." He then described it—eloquently and brilliantly but the exercise produced no definition and, in fact, no clearcut description. At the end, it produced the following colloquy:

> *Carr*: Mr. MacLeish, isn't "culture" a rather cloudy term to the man on the street? And might it not also mean different things to different nations? If we mean to include education, let us say so, as the Chinese proposed, by explicit reference. I do want to express the conviction of my colleagues that mutual understanding, based on educational cooperation, is vital to the success of the world organization that this conference is building. Educational cooperation is *not* a minor gadget to be added to the machinery of international life later on. It is the motor which makes the machine run.
>
> *Secretary MacLeish*: You know, that's convinced me. . . . Without that we'll never obtain a lasting peace.

At 8:15 in the morning of May 16, the ABLE group met at some length with the entire United States Delegation to discuss our collective views on education's role in the Charter. On the same day, I received a telegram advising me that the House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs had voted favorably on Congressman Mundt's resolution.

In fact, May 16 was the day the breakthrough became visible. *The San Francisco Chronicle* declared that the role of education had become a crucial issue at the United Nations Conference. *The San Francisco News* predicted (correctly) that a United Nations education conference would be held within the next few months. *The New York Times* said that the discussion about education was one of the most significant developments of the Conference.

At 9:40 p.m. on May 22, when the Conference was exactly four weeks old, a definite reference to the promotion (not merely provision) of educational cooperation was unanimously approved in the Drafting Committee on a motion offered by the United States Delegation. On the same day, the Mundt resolution passed the House of Representatives without a dissenting vote. On May 24, I received word that the Taft-Fulbright resolution had passed the Senate unanimously. From this point on, there was no question that the language of the Drafting Committee would remain in the Charter. I began to make my plans to leave San Francisco a few days before the signing ceremonies.

During these weeks in San Francisco, I wrote a daily letter to several hundred educational and civic leaders in the United States. In my letter of May 24, I wrote that the developments in San Francisco and in Washington were steps by which "the profession of education has not only registered a great achievement; it has also taken up a profound obligation." We had asked for the opportunity to cooperate in educational matters with our colleagues throughout the world and to enlist education in the total effort to maintain peace. In the months and years ahead the teaching profession of the world would have a chance to show whether it could make a contribution of significance. At that time, in San Francisco, I had no doubt that this would be done. I knew then, and I know now, that success requires the same attention to international matters in education, the same emphasis on international cooperation in professional organizations, the same diligent teamwork as had been required to achieve the recognition we had won in the United Nations Charter.

In order that there might be a contemporary record of the San Francisco events in June 1945, I wrote, for publication by the

Foreign Policy Association, *Only by Understanding*—a title adopted from writings on peace by Albert Einstein. This book provided a comprehensive account of previous efforts to enlist education in the search for peace and an outline for future efforts.

In February 1946, Ginn and Company published *One World in the Making*, a textbook which I wrote in the hope that it might make it easier for anyone, young or old, to understand the new United Nations Charter. This effort was only mildly successful; I put in too much detail, told more about the Charter than any mildly interested student would want to know, and failed to convey any emotional excitement about the possible value of the United Nations to liberate humankind from "the scourge of war." A second edition of this book in 1947, with about fifteen percent of new material added, prolonged its useful life for another two years.

In summary

The United Nations Charter as it came from San Francisco included nine explicit references to education.

In Chapter Four, the General Assembly was authorized to make recommendations for international educational cooperation.

In Chapter Nine, the United Nations was directed to promote solutions of international problems of educational cooperation. Member nations were pledged to take separate and collective action to this end.

In Chapter Ten, the Economic and Social Council is authorized to make studies on educational matters and to make recommendations to the General Assembly, to members of the United Nations, and to its specialized agencies.

In Chapter Eleven, members of the United Nations responsible for territories whose people have not obtained a full measure of self-government must provide educational development for such people. They must also report regularly on educational conditions.

Chapters Twelve and Thirteen contain additional provisions regarding education in trust territories.

On July 12, 1945, I appeared before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to urge that the Senate promptly ratify the United Nations Charter. I said that the NEA had in 1919 strongly (although unsuccessfully) endorsed ratification of the League of Nations Covenant. I pointed out that unlike the League Covenant, the United Nations Charter provided, in six of its chapters, for international cooperation in education and cultural relations, that the Charter is, in fact, "the first great international document to give explicit recognition to the powerful force of education in keeping the peace."

There was no Senate attack on the Charter because it contained nine references to "education." The final vote on ratification in the Senate was nearly unanimous.

The strong and sustained interest of teachers in the United Nations was brilliantly demonstrated in 1954 when the National Education Association met in New York City. We were able to arrange for a special session of the Convention in the General Assembly Hall of the UN Headquarters—the only time, I believe, that the Hall has been used for such a purpose. The Hall was filled. I shared the speaker's platform with UN Secretary-General Dag Hammerskjold. This activity brought to the UN Headquarters the largest number of visitors ever recorded for a single week. Mr. Hammerskjold was extremely helpful not only during that week but also in many other ways over the years. I thought about these things when, in 1962, with a Committee representing the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession, we placed a wreath on Dag Hammerskjold's grave in Uppsala, Sweden.

UNESCO begins in London

While the United Nations Charter activities went on in San Francisco and in Washington, related efforts were underway in London. Here there had been established, in cooperation with the Ministry of Education of the United Kingdom, a Council of Allied Ministers of Education. This Council consisted, for the most part, of Ministers of Education attached to the numerous governments in exile which moved to London when their countries were occupied during World War II. Once the general principle had been established in San Francisco that the United Nations system would concern itself with educational cooperation, it became necessary to hold an international conference to prepare the organization to conduct future inter-governmental activities in education. Rehabilitation of education in war-devastated countries was a matter of high priority.

The United Nations Conference for the Establishment of an Educational and Cultural Organization opened in London on

November 1, 1945. I was sent to London by the United States Department of State at the request of the British Government to serve as deputy to Sir Alfred Zimmern, the Secretary-General of the London Conference. I substituted for Sir Alfred wherever he needed my help. He also assigned me to staff the committee which prepared the preamble and statement of purposes of the organization. This Drafting Committee included delegates from France, India, Mexico, Poland, and the United Kingdom under the chairmanship of Archibald MacLeish, of the United States Delegation.

The cold peace

The plenary sessions of the Conference met at the headquarters offices of the Institute of Civil Engineers. My own office was in the library of this building–the largest, most imposing, and coldest office I have ever occupied. It was, I learned, the historic place where the plans were drawn for the sea-going docks which, under the code-name "Mulberry," were used in the D-Day invasion of the north of France.

I have said that the library was cold but so was almost every other enclosed space in London. The work of putting the UNESCO Charter together was like trying to assemble a delicate watch, under a strict time limit, never being quite sure one had all the pieces, while sitting in a large refrigerator, and being hungry most of the time. I cannot say that I knew war-time London but I did know cold and hunger and I could imagine (perhaps) how much worse it had been for the Londoners while the bombs were falling. In spite of the efforts of our hosts, there was never enough of anything. A glass of milk, a plate of ham and eggs, a chocolate bar, a half grapefruit, or a cake of soap with enough water for a good hot bath–these were just a few things that to the Londoner, were nearly forgotten memories. My admiration grew for "the finest hours" of the people of England.

The London Conference included delegates from 45 of the then approximately 50 United Nations member nations; the only large, powerful, and eligible absentee being the Soviet Union.*

---

*The others absent were: Ethiopia, Paraguay, Costa Rica, and Honduras.

112

"In the minds of men"

In delivering the address of welcome, Prime Minister Clement Atlee asked a question which was later modified for use in the UNESCO Charter. "Do not wars," asked Mr. Atlee, "after all, begin in the minds of men?" The UNESCO Charter answered the Prime Minister's rhetorical question with these words: ". . .since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed" and placed those words first in the UNESCO Constitution.

The British Minister of Education, Ellen Wilkinson, in a short address on being elected President of the Conference, noted that education would be the emphatic first word in the title of the new organization. Business-like, efficient, sharp-tongued at times, Miss Wilkinson made an excellent Conference President. She spoke up forcefully for education and she called for cooperation by teachers everywhere. "I would like," she said, "to send my voice beyond these walls and address myself to teachers wherever they are carrying on their self-sacrificing labors. I say to them: Pay attention to what is being done here in London. When this Organization is established make it your own to reflect your wishes and to meet your needs. See that its influence penetrates from the officials at its center to the scattered workers on the circumference, so that the unity of the teaching profession may at last be no empty slogan but a living reality."

It soon became clear, however, both in the text of the Charter and in the next few years of UNESCO's activity, that some delegates and their governments were not ready to agree with such an assignment of priorities. One of the striking features of the London Conference was that there were practically no teachers or other educators in the delegations. Most of the delegates were cabinet members, ambassadors, and diplomatic personnel.

In the closing address of the first day, the chief French Delegate, the skilled, cultivated former Premier, Leon Blum, survivor of four years in a concentration camp, made an emotional plea that the offices of UNESCO be located in Paris. The French Delegation also suggested, unsuccessfully, that the word "education" be dropped from the title of the Organization. On November 9 it was voted that UNESCO be located in Paris, the delegation of the United Kingdom making the reservation that the selection would be reviewed in five years.

On November 6 the decision was reached to call the new organization the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. The addition of "Scientific" made the title rather cumbersome, but spokespersons for this aspect of education and culture insisted successfully that science be singled out for specific mention. This decision gave UNESCO the distinction of having the longest and most complex official title of any of the specialized agencies of the United Nations. It meant, in practice, that the organization would almost always be referred to by its acronym. This practice in turn led to some public confusion and the belief of some observers that UNESCO was a kind of tea-biscuit, somewhere between Uneeda and Nabisco.

Summing up the London Conference, the French philosopher Etienne Gilson remarked that "San Francisco had made the United Nations one body; London gave the United Nations a soul."

On November 15, 1945, the UNESCO Charter was completed and adopted. To the British Minister of Education that evening one of her Cabinet colleagues said, "Well, Ellen, it's a race now between your Conference and the atom." I suppose it still is.

The vacant chair

On November 12 the officers of the London Conference sent a telegram to the Soviet Union expressing the hope that a Soviet Delegation might even yet join the work of the Conference. There had been no response from Moscow to several earlier invitations and there was no response to this new telegram. The changing relationships of the Soviet Union to UNESCO are complex and enigmatic. Since the Soviet Union had willingly agreed to Article 55 of the United Nations Charter which requires cooperation in promoting international educational and cultural relations, no one at the London Conference of 1945 doubted that the USSR would join the organization. So certain were we that, when arrangements were made to elect the first Executive Board of UNESCO, it was agreed that the elected person who received the fewest votes would stand ready to resign from the Executive Board in order that the Soviet Union, when it did join, might have a seat on the governing body.

However, three East European states, Poland, Czeckoslovakia, and Hungary, participated in the benefits of UNESCO membership, especially for the reconstruction of their war-damaged schools. In late 1953 or early 1954, when UNESCO's post-war reconstruction activities had tapered off, all three announced their withdrawal from the organization because, they said, it was nothing but an instrument of American imperialism. Meantime, the Russian boycott of UNESCO continued. Moscow ignored letters and cables, the borders of the Soviet Union were closed to UNESCO publications, the Soviet representatives on other United Nations bodies attacked UNESCO whenever the organization's program was on the agenda–and sometimes when it wasn't on the agenda. The Soviet press continued its hostility to UNESCO and all its works.

Yet, on April 21, 1954, the Soviet Union signed the Constitution of UNESCO and on May 12 the Soviet Ambassador in London signed the Constitution on behalf of the U.S.S.R.'s state members of the United Nations, Byelorussia and the Ukraine. All three states thereupon became full national members of UNESCO, each with as much voting power as the United States or Canada or France or any other national member. No official explanation for the nine years of delay has ever come to my attention.

After the Soviet Union itself had become a member, all three of the states which had threatened to withdraw a few months earlier withdrew their withdrawals.

Homeward bound

Most of the Americans at the London Conference returned to the United States by the only available transport, a returning troop ship. The *Europa* was a large vessel, built by the Germans for the thriving pre-war cross-Atlantic tourist business. It was, by chance, the same liner as my family and I had used during our visit to Europe in 1938. In December 1945, it carried some 6,000 returning soldiers, plus about 20 civilians, plus eight dogs. The dogs were company mascots, of assorted colors, sizes, and shapes. Each dog wore a uniform with the appropriate unit insignia. Every dog had the same rank. They were all top sergeants and wore the chevrons to prove it. It had been strictly forbidden to bring pets aboard and the soldiers and their sea bags had been checked as they boarded. How the dogs were smuggled aboard remained a mystery. Not one of them was visible until *Europa* was well away from the Southampton pier.

The crossing was pleasant. The weather was unusually mild considering the early winter season. The vessel took on a slight list as soon as it no longer had the Southampton dock to lean against and that list continued for the entire crossing. The soldiers slept in the main salon and dining rooms, their bunks in some places seven layers high. We civilians were much better housed; there were only twelve of us, four bunks high, in a stateroom originally designed for two persons. The kitchen was in constant use; each man had two good meals a day at exactly prescribed times and the line along the serving counter never ended.

The best part of the trip was the entry into New York Harbor. It was a misty morning and when the great statue in the Harbor rather suddenly emerged from the fog she was greeted by such a cry from those 6,000 men as I shall not forget.

In March and April 1946, the Congress set about the formality of approving the UNESCO Charter. With many others, I testified on behalf of UNESCO before the appropriate Congressional Committees. I said that the teachers of the United States had been deeply committed to international cooperation in education. They had taught in the years between two world wars that nations should solve their differences by peaceful means. This teaching was clearly ineffective, not primarily because it was inexpertly done or because the ideal itself was bad, but because other countries failed to provide similar kinds of guidance. While we had been teaching for peace and good will, other countries were teaching for war and aggression. The result was disaster.

Unless we were prepared to harness our schools permanently to preparation for war, we would be obliged to find a means whereby international agreement in education could proceed. This is the principal purpose of UNESCO. I then proceeded to show that (a) UNESCO would be a useful part of United States foreign policy, (b) UNESCO commanded popular support among the American people, and (c) the UNESCO Charter conforms to the Constitutional procedures and usage of the United States with reference to education.

Direct or indirect promotion

Meanwhile it had been decided that the First General Conference of UNESCO would meet in Paris in 1946 and the well-known British biologist, Julian Huxley, was named Secretary of the Preparatory Commission with Howard Wilson of the United States as his Deputy. In May, 1946, Julian Huxley and his wife visited the

United States and I was asked by the State Department to take them both sightseeing. Thus we spent a pleasant morning together in a fairly long drive and a short walk to Mount Vernon. It became clear to me at that time that the UNESCO Secretary and I had quite different viewpoints.

Professor Huxley foresaw education contributing to peace and security by conferences and exchanges among university professors, scientists, and philosophers. Education programs within UNESCO would work indirectly and its achievements in international peace would be by-products of high-level scientific and cultural cooperation. One of his high-priority programs, for example, was a thorough re-examination of the flora and fauna of the Galapagos Islands. A proposal for a more direct approach to education for peace by evaluating what is being taught in school classrooms in various countries appeared to him to be a less promising method.

The resolution approving UNESCO cleared the House of Representatives by a vote of 261 to 41; similar action followed in the Senate and on June 30, 1946, I watched with a dozen witnesses as President Truman signed the legislation at the White House.

Shortly after the signing ceremony, I was appointed to the United States National Commission for UNESCO. For several years I served on its Executive Committee and on various special task forces. The legislation empowered the Commission to advise the State Department on UNESCO affairs and to assist in promoting an understanding of UNESCO among the American people. Several national conferences were convened by the Commission with these purposes in mind. I spoke regularly at these conferences and gave the keynote address at the opening of the National Conference on UNESCO in San Francisco. This Conference was held in the same building (the Opera House) as the UN Conference some years earlier. I left the National Commission for UNESCO in 1952 after serving two consecutive three-year terms.

In January 1946 I took the initiative (since no one else seemed to be interested) in inviting the Cultural and Educational Attachés of Embassies accredited to Washington to a meeting to promote useful contacts among these diplomats and a better understanding of United States private and governmental services of interest to them. I had been meeting them informally during the war. It seemed to me a pity to let these relationships lapse. With this start, the Round-Table of Cultural and Educational Attaches was launched and has met monthly for the last thirty years. I still receive a courtesy invitation to these meetings and I attend often.

The first time I saw Paris

When the first UNESCO Delegate Assembly convened in Paris in November 1946, I did all I could to bring about the election of Howard Wilson to the post of Director-General. The maneuvers of the two-week period on the selection of the Director-General were vigorous and complex. The instruction to the United States Delegation was to work for the election of a distinguished Philadelphia lawyer who lacked background in education and in international relations. The United States Delegation leaders had been so definitely instructed on this point that they apparently felt unable to deviate from their instructions or to ask for new instructions even though it was increasingly clear that the man they nominated could not possibly be elected. In the end, the Conference elected Julian Huxley as the Organization's first Director-General. He held that office for a two-year term.

Personally, I had a rather unusual role at the 1946 UNESCO Conference. I was not a delegate and not a member of the Secretariat. The French Government had designated November as "UNESCO Month" and the Sorbonne had arranged, as its contribution to UNESCO Month, a series of six lectures. I was invited to deliver one of those lectures.

I quote below a few paragraphs from that address.

Holding to the Central Purpose

> The Constitution of UNESCO contains a clear and definite statement of its purpose. According to Article I, the *purpose* of the Organization is "to contribute to peace and security." According to this same Article, the *method* by which the purpose will be carried out is international collaboration through education, science, and the *reason* why peace and security are desired is to establish respect for justice, law, human rights, and fundamental freedoms.
>
> The word "purpose" is singular; no other purpose is named in any article of the Constitution . . .

The statement in Article I that the Organization exists "to contribute to peace and security" is not an accident. It was put into the Charter deliberately and after discussion. The wording in Article I is important, authoritative, binding.

I say, therefore, that if there is another major war UNESCO will have failed and that if there is not another war UNESCO, together with all the other apparatus for international relations, will have succeeded; my test of failure and success is as simple and as exacting as that... No one can read the Preamble and the statement of purpose, or can examine the records of the discussions which led to the calling of the London Conference, or the records of the London Conference itself, and fail to conclude that the purpose of the Organization is peace and security. And if that be granted, are not other considerations, desirable as they might be in themselves, an impertinence, a shocking irrelevancy as compared to the great over-riding necessity of our day? The purpose of UNESCO is not to increase or to disseminate knowledge for its own sake, or to preserve and protect for its own sake the knowledge that men have won in the past. The purpose of UNESCO is to use, protect, increase, and disseminate the education and culture and science which can be reasonably expected to contribute significantly to peace and security.

In any system of priorities for UNESCO, the activities which will contribute solidly and surely to peace and security should have complete and unquestioned precedence. Activities which contribute only slightly or doubtfully to peace and security should have only a slight or experimental emphasis.

It may well be that in some happier and more secure time, perhaps even within the lifetime of some of us, UNESCO may, in the full sunshine of international tranquility, turn some part of its great resources to the pursuit of knowledge and the refinement of the arts. I hope that time will come; the sooner the better. But I am sure that the terrible urgencies of the present day do not now permit or warrant indulgence in such excursions....

> At least in international affairs, the greatest need of our time is not to know more, but to do better.
>
> Is more information the answer to the problems of mankind? Would we be nearer to solving our major international problems if we knew more about archeology, astronomy, history, economics, chemistry, or physiology? In some instance we would be; as a rule, we would not. What we need in our national educational systems, as in the educational policy for peace which UNESCO must help to shape is a period when we shall devote our resources, not so much to expanding our knowledge, as to applying it, not so much to finding out what to do, as to doing what we already know we ought to do, not so much to research, as to action.
>
> The worship of knowledge and of the processes of increasing knowledge are so strongly and universally held . . . that there is no danger that the necessary process of increasing the sum of human knowledge will slow down, much less come to a halt. Let UNESCO then concentrate its efforts mainly upon the utilization of knowledge for promoting the peace and security of mankind.

The ending of UNESCO's first General Assembly meeting in December 1946, marked the end of an epoch in the intellectual history of humankind. The Organization was in being, it had an organized if somewhat uncertain budget, and appointed a Director-General who already had a considerable staff.

Mexico City and after

In its early years, the UNESCO General Conference met annually, rather than on the present biennial schedule. Thus the Second General Conference was held in 1947 in Mexico City. I was an advisor on the United States Delegation and served as vice-chairman of the working party on Education.

The London Conference had been concerned with the structure of UNESCO. The Paris Conference had been concerned mainly with the Organization's general goals. In Mexico the Conference for the first time gave a central position to its program—what UNESCO should do.

After the 1947 Conference I was never again invited to serve as a representative of the United States at any General Conference of UNESCO. I have often wondered whether there was some reason for this and have speculated without conclusions on what the reason could be.

I have, however, maintained quite close direct connections with UNESCO. For example, I lectured at the first UNESCO Seminar on Education for International Understanding at Sevres in 1947, did liaison work with the UNESCO secretariat in behalf of WCOTP in 1949, and I visited the UNESCO Headquarters in Paris about once a year, on the average, from 1947 to 1972. Most of these meetings related the work of UNESCO to that of the organized teaching profession, and, I believe, to the mutual advantage of both parties.

In 1951, on the invitation of UNESCO itself, I attended as a consultant a conference in Cairo on teacher exchange among the Arab nations. This meeting is more fully described in Chapter XI.

In 1964 I was named Chairman of the first UNESCO Expert Conference on the Status of Teachers. The background and development of that theme are covered in Chapter IX.

In 1967 I was appointed by the Director-General of UNESCO to his Liaison Advisory Committee on Literacy. The activities of that Committee are related in Chapter XII.

To round out the account of my major contacts with UNESCO, I should add that in October 1968 I went to Mexico City to give the summarizing speech to a Conference on Education and Sport, sponsored by UNESCO and several non-governmental international organizations. Since the 1968 Olympic Games opened the day after our Conference adjourned, the attendance included an unusually large number of well-known experts in physical fitness, health, athletic coaching, and sports. I would have liked to stay for at least part of the Games but the pressure of other work brought me back to Washington immediately after the Conference adjourned.

Turning point in a long road

Previous efforts to create an international agency such as UNESCO had failed. The predecessor of the United Nations Charter, the Covenant of the League of Nations, provided no reference whatever to education. A representative of the National

Education Association of the United States was accorded one brief hearing near the end of the 1919 Conference that prepared the Covenant of the League of Nations. In 1921 the League of Nations Assembly deleted the word "education" from one of its documents, with only one vote (that of Haiti) opposing the deletion.

Why were the 1945-46 efforts at San Francisco, London, and Paris more successful? There are several reasons.

First, teachers had shown a sustained and informed interest in international affairs throughout the whole era between the two World Wars and especially in the years 1939-45.

Second, the United States State Department decided to try to make the United Nations Charter reflect the public opinion of this country. Without the State Department's concern for public opinion and without an organized teaching profession which had shown its interest and competence to express an opinion the events of San Francisco and London would not have occurred as they did.

Third, in 1919 the NEA representative at the Paris Peace Conference, Dr. Fannie Fern Andrews, was speaking for about 8,000 educational leaders. The NEA representative at San Francisco and London spoke for about 900,000 teachers.

Fourth, the Nazi Party illustration of the power of education to make war, taught all of us about the power of education, even if only from observing the devastating effects of the Axis school system.

Fifth, the creation of the NEA War and Peace Fund provided the financial resources necessary to a successful campaign. For three years before San Francisco, portions of this Fund provided the financial support to mount a program of public information—dozens of broadcasts, scores of regional conferences, and thousands of leaflets, pamphlets, and posters were designed, developed, and distributed to transmit to other citizens the conviction of teachers that they had a contribution to make to peace.

Finally—and really an outgrowth of all the other explanations, the support of citizens outside the teaching profession was crucial. When the combined representatives of the Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the four major farm organizations joined the small educational contingent at San Francisco in asking that education be included in the United Nations Charter, the outcome of such a demonstration of united public opinion could hardly be in doubt.

7 Endicott and Glasgow

Precursors–One more try–Constitutional–Understanding, reconstruction, UNESCO–Personalities–Evaluation –Follow-up

Less than six months after World War II, General Dwight D. Eisenhower, accepting an honorary degree from President Daniel Marsh of Boston University, asked, "Why doesn't the educational world put my profession out of business?" We do not know what answer was made to General Eisenhower's inquiry.

Precursors

The tragedy of a second global war in less than a quarter century rested heavily on the minds of many people. In 1938 at the International Documentation Conference in Oxford, I heard H.G. Wells propose a plan to save civilization through an international system of organizing and sharing knowledge. But after another major war, Wells concluded that the jaded world was devoid of recuperative power. His earlier optimism, he wrote in *Mind at the End of Its Tether,* had been replaced by a stoic cynicism. He declared that only a small adaptable minority of humankind could possibly survive; the others, he predicted, would find opiates and other consolations and trouble themselves no more about their own survival or the survival of the species.

But as far as teachers were concerned, the greater part were not prepared to concede with Mr. Wells that his often-quoted race between education and catastrophe had ended with catastrophe breaking the tape. Teachers were, on the whole, inclined to take up General Eisenhower's challenge and to make a strong effort to set up institutions which might at least have a chance of putting the General's vocation, as he said, "out of business." To that end, teachers helped in crucial ways to secure educational provisions in the United Nations Charter, and to establish UNESCO. There was one other effort that only the teachers could make without outside help or influence. That was to create effective machinery for international cooperation within the teaching profession itself.

The first international organization of teachers was, in fact, set up by the secondary school teachers of France, Belgium, and Holland in 1912. In 1936, it was enlarged to include other European teachers' organizations and became known as the International Federation of Teachers in Public Secondary Schools or (by its acronym in French) as FIPESO. Meanwhile a counterpart European organization for primary teachers called the International Federation of Teachers' Associations (IFTA) had been established in 1926. In the period between the two world wars, these two international organizations had few contacts outside of Europe and indeed had few contacts with one another. In most of Europe, the secondary teacher and the primary teacher belonged, until comparatively recent times, to separate professions.

In 1921, just a quarter-century before General Eisenhower's Boston University challenge, the National Education Association of the United States had called a world conference on education to be held in San Francisco in conjunction with the 1923 NEA Assembly of Delegates. President Harding, at the request of the NEA, issued the formal invitations to this meeting. Representatives of more than 40 countries thus assembled in San Francisco. Contributing to this initial success was the advance support of Thomas Masaryk, founder and first president of the Czechoslovak Republic. In fact, Dr. Masaryk sent a letter to the NEA in 1921 urging it to take the initiative in calling the founding conference. The San Francisco conference led to the formation of the World Federation of Education Associations, WFEA, which met seven times at two-year intervals. These seven meetings were held in London, Dublin, Edinburgh, Geneva, Denver, Toronto, and Tokyo. When the war came in 1939 most of the directors of WFEA, retired from active teaching and administrative duties, were voluntarily devoting their time to helping the organization. As the years of the war passed, some of these directors died, others were isolated by wartime restrictions, still others were unable because of ill health to contribute to a vigorous WFEA program.

One more try

It seemed apparent, when the war was coming to an end in 1945, that a new start should be considered. Accordingly, on the day President Truman signed the UNESCO Constitution, the NEA announced that it was inviting representatives of the national teachers' organizations in other countries to a conference in Endicott, N.Y., which would consider, among other agenda items, how teachers could cooperate with the newly-formed intergovernmental educational organization of UNESCO.

The meeting included 56 delegates from 38 major teachers' organizations of 28 countries–Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eire, El Salvador, England, Greece, Haiti, Iceland, Iraq, Mexico, the Netherlands, Northern Ireland, Norway, Peru, Poland, Scotland, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United States. We proposed four major topics for discussion at the Conference: (1) strengthening international teachers' organizations; (2) a cooperative program for teaching international understanding; (3) reconstruction of the schools in countries devastated by the war; and (4) the relations between UNESCO and the world's organized teachers. At the Conference itself, working committees were formed for each of the four areas.

I began the correspondence regarding the World Teachers Conference late in 1944 after I had presented the plans to the NEA Executive Committee and Executive Secretary Givens, and received their approval. The largest and most representative teachers' associations in each of the United Nations were invited. In addition, although their countries were not then members of the United Nations, the teachers' organizations of Sweden, Switzerland, and Ireland were invited. State associations affiliated with the NEA were enlisted to serve as hosts for delegates from various countries. The cooperating state associations were those of California, Illinois, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. In most cases these states sent a carefully-selected host-observer to the Endicott Conference. They made an excellent impression and added much to the conference. As one of the guests remarked, they "must have been selected for their hospitable manner and language facility." The Conference met in August 1946, at the

Center called "The Homestead." It included, with the cooperation of the American Library Association, an exhibit of children's books and learning aids used throughout the world to forward international understanding. The facilities of the Conference Center were generously contributed by the International Business Machine Corporation; other expenses were met by the NEA War and Peace Fund and by the cooperating state education associations.

A press tent was set up with a news-ticker and typewriters. The regular press coverage was excellent. Besides the three local dailies of Endicott and Binghamton, the *Christian Science Monitor* and the *New York Times* placed full-time reporters at the Conference and the *New York Herald-Tribune* was almost as assiduous. The *Times* carried 19 articles about the Conference. In the 12 months following, 23 magazine articles about the Conference were written and published.

An interesting and valuable feature of the Endicott Conference was the first trial use of a small portable radio receiver for simultaneous interpretation. This new equipment, now widely used at international conferences, needed a thorough testing under working conditions. We were glad to supply the working test in return for free use of the equipment.

Constitutional

The First Committee meeting chaired, by Margaret Pringle (Educational Institute of Scotland), considered and rejected the possibility of building the desired all-inclusive world organization of teachers on the remains of any one of the pre-existing organizations. In this respect the Endicott Conference followed the lead of the governments which had recently established a new organization, the United Nations, rather than attempting to revive the old League of Nations. We had anticipated this question and had made sure that official representatives of the New Educational Fellowship (International), the World Federation of Education Associations (represented by the treasurer, a director, and its acting secretary-general), the Confederacion Americano Magisterio, and the International Federation of Secondary Teachers were present and fully involved in these discussions. The decision to start anew was unanimous.

It was agreed that the basic control of the new World Organization of the Teaching Profession (WOTP) should reside in a Delegate Assembly composed in the main of delegates from the national member organizations; that each national member should be entitled to a minimum of three delegates and that large organizations could send one additional delegate for each 2,000 individual members up to a maximum of 50 delegates.

The rules for voting in the Assembly of Delegates by national members were much less favorable to the large organizations than the allotment of delegates. Every national member was entitled to at least one vote; additional votes were allowed on the basis of one vote for each 50,000 individual members, with a ceiling of five votes.

Thus, the National Education Association of the United States, for instance, would be entitled to name as many as 50 delegates, but each delegate under such circumstances, would be alloted only one-tenth of a vote. It was assumed that in all ordinary proceedings each delegation would cast its vote or votes as a single unit.

The Constitution also stated that the ideal situation would be to have only one national teachers' organization in each country and to assign it one vote per country in the world organization. Since unity within each country had not yet been achieved, the complicated voting and delegate formulas were regarded as necessary.

It was agreed that each national member would pay WOTP a fee of two cents (U.S.) per member per year.

The Constitution provided also for an Executive Committee of seven members (to be elected by and responsible to the Delegate Assembly) and for the Secretary-General to be appointed by the Executive Committee

To me, the new WOTP Constitution represented an important forward movement in several respects. First, its clear purpose was to be global and all-embracing, thus distinguishing itself from organizations concerned with some single level of education, elementary or secondary or vocational. Second, it was to meet annually, rather than every two years as had been the case with the WFEA. In my view, a two-year lapse between meetings was just short enough to keep the Federation alive in a favorable environment, and long enough to keep it in a condition of permanent frailty. Third, WOTP assumed the existence of a Secretariat which would enable it to have some active, year-round, on-going program and thus prevent it from becoming merely a one-week festival of speeches and resolutions.

The First Committee also recommended, and the Conference agreed, that WOTP would formally come into existence when ten or more national associations signed the Draft Constitution. In the closing ceremonies the delegates from each participating organization signed the Constitution which they had drafted and adopted.

There was discussion about a proposal that Executive Committee members be elected on a regional basis. Unanimous agreement was reached that executive committee members be elected at large.

Understanding, reconstruction, UNESCO

The Second Committee dealt with teaching international understanding. Presided over by E. Floyd Willoughby of the Canadian Teachers Federation, it was the most popular section of the Conference for those participants who were not assigned to any special Committee. It was also the least controversial. It recommended, *inter alia,* that education for international understanding would not involve the sacrifice of national cultures or the diminution of national citizenship. The Committee saw great possibilities in the teaching of history, modern languages, music, art, and literature. It suggested continued efforts to build a supplementary international language. It foresaw the wider use of mass communications media in teaching and increasing international exchange among both teachers and students.

The Third Committee, led by W. de Lange of the Netherlands Council of Secondary Teachers, studied the post-war problems of schools in war-devastated areas. Ten of the delegations at Endicott came from countries in which schools had suffered severe damage as a result of military action during the war. To them, the basic problems of survival were most urgent. They found in the other delegations a friendly and generous response. The entire balance of the NEA War and Peace Fund was devoted to educational relief and reconstruction. I had been named a public member of the Committee on Remittances to Europe (CARE) and that organization did a superb job in procurement and distribution of relief. The Committee recommended that relief for schools be cleared through UNESCO.

When the report of the Third Committee came before the Conference as a whole there was some discussion as to whether assistance in re-establishing war-devastated schools should be made available in Germany. The Swiss delegate insisted that it was impossible to ignore Germany but the delegate of the Polish Teachers Union said that before helping Germany it was essential to build up the rest of Europe.

The Fourth Committee, presided over by Ralph Morley of the National Union of Teachers of England and Wales, dealt with recommendations to UNESCO. This new organization was well represented by several observers at Endicott, including Howard Wilson, Deputy Executive Secretary of the UNESCO Preparatory Commission, and Herbert Abraham, the research and analysis officer of the UNESCO relations staff of the United States State Department.

The Committee's first recommendation urged that representatives of the World Organization of the Teaching Profession serve on the UNESCO Secretariat and that the member states of UNESCO should include a practicing teacher or an appointed official of a teachers' organization among each national delegation to the UNESCO General Conference and among the membership of UNESCO committees that deal with educational questions. This modest proposal has been reiterated from time to time by various national and international teachers' organizations. It has probably had some influence but, with only a few notable exceptions, it has not been followed. I believe that UNESCO would be today a better international organization if this recommendation had been seriously taken.

Second, the Committee applauded the UNESCO program plans for the reduction of illiteracy and urged all teachers and all their organizations to assist this part of the UNESCO program.

The third recommendation was that UNESCO prepare a Convention by which all UNESCO member-states would agree (within, of course, the limits of their respective constitutional and administrative systems) to direct their school systems toward international understanding and away from the inculcation of national prejudice. This has not been done to this day. Perhaps it is impossible, but I don't see how one can be *sure* until it is tried.

The fourth recommendation was that UNESCO should bestir itself to promote international exchange of students and teachers. I believe that this proposal has been carried into effect.

The final suggestion was that UNESCO commit itself to "a world-wide program to lift the status" of teachers and "to promote their intellectual, material, social, and civic interests and rights." That recommendation was prophetic. How the proposal to deal with the status of teachers was implemented is a long and complex story—enough to require separate treatment (Chapter IX).

Personalities

Before turning from the preceding survey of the working committees to an evaluation and summary of the Endicott Conference as a whole, a few sentences should be inserted about some of the personalities who participated. Ralph Morley, the chief delegate from England and Wales, was not only a highly successful leader of his professional organization but also an elected Laborite Member of Parliament. Another British delegate, a former president of the National Union of Teachers of England and Wales, G.C.T. Giles, was a member of the Communist Party in England. Nearly all of the participants from Europe had been mistreated during the war. Mme. Vetterova-Pastrnokova, one of the two Czech participants, had during the war used her home as a counselling center for youth. For this she was arrested, shipped to a concentration camp in Poland, and tattooed on her forearm as Prisoner No. 42798. The two participants from Norway had led their fellow-teachers in a nationwide resistance to the attempted brutal Nazification of the Norwegian schools. Professor T.C. Chang had, with his colleagues and students in the National Central University of Nanking, been driven out by the invading Japanese armies as far as Chungking where, despite great practical difficulties, they re-established their university for the rest of the war's long duration. Gerald Hippolite of Haiti had been active in the struggle against corrupt government. Another young Latin American revolutionary, Carlos Montana Daza of Bolivia, had been with those who successfully toppled the government of his country.

In my subsequent work with WOTP I have seen many of the Endicott participants again. Leaving aside the NEA delegation and other Americans, I count nineteen of the Endicott participants whom I have seen on at least one other occasion since 1946, either in their own countries, or on the occasion of a further visit by them in the United States, or at international conferences.

Evaluation

It seems accurate to me in evaluating Endicott to claim success. After all, it did undoubtedly lay the conceptual and organizational basis for the most nearly universal teachers' organization in the history of education, an organization which was to accomplish even more in the future. There are, however, some negative elements in the evaluation.

For one thing, the fact that the place of the meeting, "The Homestead" was owned by the International Business Machines Corporation and that IBM contributed to other Conference expenses including maintenance and the use of the translating equipment, was made into a serious handicap by those who did not want the new organization to succeed. In that first summer after the war, relatively quiet self-contained conference facilities for a full two-week meeting of the size required were hard to find. Nowadays many such places exist but most of them have been built since 1946. Furthermore, we had no funds to pay the going rate for such facilities. The participants from most of post-war Europe and many other parts of the world had to travel under currency restrictions which made it quite impossible for them to pay their own expenses.

Communist Party members were functioning in varying degrees of strength within most of the teachers' organizations of Europe—and to a lesser extent, of Latin America and Asia. The Russians, however, stayed away from Endicott just as they stayed away from London and UNESCO. We had the name and address in Moscow of the All Soviet Union of Educational Workers. They received an invitation to the Conference at the same time as the other participants. The response, after a long delay, came through Mr. A. Gromov in the Soviet Embassy in Washington. It was a request for more information. Accordingly I walked the half block down Sixteenth Street from my office to the Soviet Embassy. Mr. Gromov asked a few questions about the Conference but mainly about the NEA—how many members, how is it organized, and other routine questions. He then asked me the name of the NEA President. I explained that the NEA President was elected for a one-year term by each successive Delegate Assembly in early July, and that the current President was Mrs. Pearl Wanamaker, then the Superintendent of Public Instruction for the State of Washington. His next question astounded me: "Is this lady a Democrat or a Republican?" I told him that for most NEA Presidents I would not be likely to know the political affiliation but that, since Mrs. Wanamaker happened to be an elected State official, I could tell him what party she belonged to. He solemnly wrote it down. He said he would send all the information to Moscow and would inform me when he received a response for me. I never heard from him again.

Some months later I went to the Soviet Embassy again to ask whether the representatives of the Soviet teachers' organization would be coming to Endicott. This time I saw another official, Mr. A.E. Ermolaev, who said I should have written to V.O.K.S., the Soviet organization which was charged, he said, with responsibility for unofficial contacts between Soviet citizens and foreign groups. We had in fact already written to V.O.K.S. and had received no answer. I pointed out that in any case we wanted a representative of their teachers' organization. But no one came, nor did any letter.

The American Teachers Federation, AFL-CIO, conducted a drumfire of hostile propaganda against the new effort to form a world organization for teachers, and dispatched a representative to Europe to urge the teachers' organizations there not to cooperate with WOTP, which their representative described in some countries as a tool of American capitalism and in other countries as a part of a communist plot.

There was no truth to the charge that IBM or any other business interest had any vested interest in the Conference or its conclusions. IBM personnel were careful not even to enter the meeting room. Perhaps the most credible witness on this particular point is Ralph Morley, head of the English delegation. He said:

> "I have not seen the slightest indication at this conference that big business is exercising, or attempting to exercise, any influence on the delegates or the conclusions arrived at by them. The discussions have been perfectly free and unfettered."

Follow-up

In order to implement the Conference decisions and to conduct other business until the Constitution was ratified and the first Delegate Assembly of WOTP would meet (presumably in the summer of 1947), the Conference elected a Preparatory Commission consisting of:

Thyra Andren (Norway Elementary Teachers)
Luis Alvarez Barrett (Mexican Teachers Syndicate)
Ralph Morley (National Union of Teachers of England and Wales)

F. L. Schlagle (National Education Association of the United
States)
Henry L. Smith (World Federation of Education Associations)

The Preparatory Commission asked me to serve as its General Secretary and (with the approval of Secretary Givens and other NEA officers present) I agreed to do so.

There was time at Endicott also for discussion of items not on the official agenda. Among these topics, some of which have since reached or approach fruition, were:

1. A survey of the status of the teaching profession
2. An international code of ethics for teachers
3. A Teachers Charter
4. An international language
5. An international university

Each of us at Endicott remembered a different aspect or trend or moment at the Conference. For me, instances of the efficiency and unity of purpose in the Conference were most gratifying. As I said in a Columbia Broadcasting System broadcast shortly after the Conference adjourned:

> "Just a week ago the members of an international conference were packing up to leave Endicott, New York. I feel sure you did not see many newspaper headlines about this conference. In these days, conflict and delay feature the news from most international meetings. The delegates to the World Conference of the Teaching Profession at Endicott, however, could look back over two work-packed weeks of cooperative effort with solid satisfaction. For whatever may happen at other international meetings, the teachers at Endicott completed a very heavy program of work, finished it on time, reached unanimous agreements, and went their several ways knowing and trusting each other better than when they met. And *that,* unfortunately, does not happen at all international gatherings."

A few months later, when I had had time to evaluate and reflect, I wrote to a friend, "The activities started at Endicott in 1946 will carry into the future and to the furthest ends of the earth. They will affect constructively the education and the life of people whom we shall never see."

That, needless to say, is a subjective opinion. But it was reinforced by the testimony of other participants. Here are two:

> *The New York Times* (September 1, 1946) ". . . the principles evolved here (in Endicott) may have a significant influence on the teaching profession throughout the world."
>
> *Phi Delta Kappan* (October 1946) "True, this conference represents but the beginning and its effectiveness will be determined by the extent of its program throughout the world. That such a beginning has been made and that such hope for the future of the organization prevails is in itself significant."

A *Washington Post* editorial observed that "everyone talks about education as the key to peace; but it has remained for some of the teachers of the world to do something constructive about it." The *Post* editorial continued, "It was a sense of their own high responsibility which brought these teachers together . . . one of the most hopeful auguries in a troubled world." A similar editorial in the *New York Herald Tribune* referred to the Conference as "refreshingly harmonious." The *Herald Tribune* said that careful preliminary work by the National Education Association and the congenial setting at Endicott had contributed to the success, but that the decisive factor was the conviction of the delegates that education is an international fellowship. International agencies had operated for years at the higher academic levels. The new organization was primarily an attempt to mobilize teachers in the primary and secondary schools, where the great mass of boys and girls are taught.

8 WOTP: Endicott to Malta

Preparatory Commission - Excuses and "reasons to the contrary" - The great enigma - Scottish support in a crisis - Glasgow, 1947 - Executive Committee activity - The outlook after Glasgow - Western Europe - The Communist bloc - Asia - Middle East and Africa - The Americas - London and the search for unity, 1948 - Berne, 1949 - Ottawa, 1950 - Malta, 1951.

The Endicott Conference ended in a solemn ceremony of Constitution-signing and with a light-hearted (but mistaken) assurance that the most difficult tasks had already been achieved.

Preparatory Commission

The Preparatory Commission met several times even while the last events of the Endicott Conference were continuing. The Commission decided to make special efforts to secure national members from the teachers' organizations of the Soviet Union, France, and Argentina. It was also decided to try to enlist as an international member the teachers' section of the World Federation of Trade Unions which was composed of the teachers in the Communist countries.

Two months after the Endicott adjournment I was able to put in the mail a formal invitation to join, ten copies of the draft Constitution, and the Document on Transitional Arrangements. These were sent to all the Associations invited to Endicott, whether or not they had been able to send representatives. Through the good offices of the Pan American Union, the Constitution was supplied in Spanish and Portuguese. In December, 1946, the first Preparatory Commission *Newsletter* was published in English and Spanish. In February 1947, the full test of the Endicott *Proceedings,* a booklet of 111 pages, was distributed. In the March 1947, *Newsletter,* a bibliography of 41 published articles about WOTP was distributed and in August the bibliography was extended by twenty additional entries.

The Preparatory Commission directed me to make contacts with UNESCO and the United Nations to the end that these organizations would confer official consultative status on WOTP as soon as it was formally established. These instructions were successfully carried out in Paris in December 1946 and at Lake Success, the temporary United Nations headquarters, in February 1947.

In December 1946, while UNESCO was holding its first meeting in Paris I took advantage of the presence there of teachers in several of the national delegations to call an informal meeting at my office in UNESCO headquarters. Representatives of 12 national and three international education associations met to discuss, among other matters, the UNESCO proposal for the drafting of an international "Teachers Charter"–a sort of combined bill of rights and code of ethics for teachers everywhere. We all agreed to support the drafting of such a document. The UNESCO Teachers Charter actually was completed and adopted in 1966–a gestation period of 18 years, not a world's record, even for deliberate speed.

The need for a world organization of teachers was clearly demonstrated by the inability of any organization competent and empowered to speak up for all teachers in the councils of UNESCO or the United Nations.

By early May 1947, the required ten national members had formally adopted the WOTP Constitution. For the record, these were the first 15 WOTP members and the dates of their ratification:

Polish Teachers Union	November 16, 1946
National Education Association of the United States	November 28, 1946
Greek Secondary Teachers Association	December 15, 1946
Greek Elementary Teachers Association	January 1, 1947
Swiss Association of Secondary Teachers	March 15, 1947
Canadian Teachers Federation	March 21, 1947
Educational Institute of Scotland	April 2, 1947

Czechoslovak Teachers Council	April 5, 1947
Luxembourg Teachers Union	May 1, 1947
Chinese National Association for the Study of Education	May 3, 1947
National Child Education Association of China	May 4, 1947
National Association of Teachers of Bolivia	May 8, 1947
Confederation of Teachers of Ciudad Trujillo (Dominican Republic)	May 8, 1947
Association of Teachers of Cibao, (Dominican Republic)	May 8, 1947
Ulster Teachers Union	June 1, 1947.

Excuses and "reasons to the contrary"

This rather poor showing gave me cause for concern but not for despair. There were various reasons for the delays. In Switzerland, for example, there was disillusion about the effectiveness of international organizations as an instrument of peace. Ratification procedures took time which overworked officials could not easily spare. International mail service to many parts of the world was slow and, when received, the ten copies of the WOTP draft documents normally had to be circulated to the national executive committee members. It was sometimes necessary to wait six months to a year for a scheduled meeting of some representative national body to act on the proposal. With few exceptions the Endicott delegates themselves did all that could be reasonably expected of them, but the basic idea of WOTP had more impact on them than it did on the other officers of their organizations who had not shared the experience of Endicott.

Political upheavals in some countries blocked or reversed the decision of the teachers organization to join WOTP. The teachers of the Dominican Republic notified us of their acceptance in May. The dictator Rafael Trujillo abolished teachers organizations in that little country and after less than two months in membership, the notices of ratification were countermanded and letters from Ciudad Trujillo spoke of "terrible conditions" and concern for the future.

In China, where a long and bloody revolution was taking place, the two original national teachers organizations joined WOTP in

May 1947. They were able, by naming local exchange students in the area, to arrange a delegation to the WOTP General Assemblies of 1947 and 1948. In 1949, the People's Republic of China was proclaimed and we could secure no further information about the teachers' organizations or their delegates. Relations between Chinese teachers and WOTP came to an abrupt end until, in 1952, they were re-established with the Chinese organizations of the Republic of China in the Province of Taiwan.

In El Salvador, following national disturbances, we were informed that the teachers' organization had "suffered a collapse."

In Chile and Peru the Endicott delegates reported that the teachers' organizations were at that time concerned solely with their own national problems.

The need for more than a year's time to consider the proposal was often given as a reason for delayed action. The Icelanders reported that they could not act before the spring of 1948, but when that time came they did affiliate and sent delegates to the August, 1948, meeting of WOTP and to many subsequent meetings. The Iraq teachers asked for more time and did not join WOTP until 1965. The Swedish teachers informed me that they were engaged in a reorganization and implied that they might consider WOTP after that process was completed. The Netherlands Secondary Teachers who had sent their own President to Endicott voted, in effect, to reject his report and to remain in their small European-centered international association limited to secondary teachers only.

The National Union of Teachers of England and Wales (NUT) constituted a very serious problem for us. The NUT was a large, well-established, influential organization with a good record of international cooperation. It had sent to Endicott a large delegation, led by the current President, Ralph Morley, M.P. Mr. Morley served as Chairman of two of the most important Endicott Conference Committees and had been elected a member of the Preparatory Commission. He said during the Endicott Conference that he personally favored WOTP and "unless I see reasons to the contrary, which are not now evident, I shall urge the British teachers to join."

Unfortunately, Mr. Morley soon encountered some "reasons to the contrary." Early in 1947 he wrote me two long letters about them.

Some NUT leaders believed that the NEA was controlled by big business. Anyone who knew of the frequent confrontations between the NEA on the one hand and the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers on the other hand, would find this belief by NUT leaders ridiculous. This charge was nevertheless being reiterated by the Communist press in Europe and by the American Federation of Teachers. A group of NUT leaders believed this charge even though their own elected President, who had been at Endicott to see for himself, denied it.

In November 1946, I stopped in England on my way to Paris to deliver the Sorbonne lecture on UNESCO. On the evening of November 15 I had dinner in London with the Endicott delegates from the NUT, plus the President-elect and the Secretary-elect, both of whom would take office at the next Easter-week General Conference of NUT. Their report was not encouraging. The NUT Executive was divided on whether the Soviet-sponsored World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) should be invited to participate in any way in WOTP. The majority of the NUT Executive would oppose affiliation with WOTP if the Communist-sponsored international organization were invited to join also. The remainder would oppose an organization which would exclude Communist teachers. I remonstrated that this controversial group had been invited at the insistence of the Preparatory Commission of which Mr. Morley was a member. I myself had no great desire to invite the Russians, for I felt sure that they would ignore or reject the invitation just as they had already ignored the invitation to Endicott.

I added with some indignation that since NUT had sent a Communist delegate to Endicott I did not see why they should oppose WOTP affiliation because it might involve Communist attendance.

The NUT General Secretary, Sir Frederick Mander, the following morning reiterated all the objections that had been raised at dinner, adding as still one more item of pressure that whatever the NUT decided would undoubtedly be followed by the Scottish Education Institute and the Ulster Teachers Union.

I said that it was irrational to accuse the NEA of being Communist-infiltrated and at the same time to accuse the Association of being a "tool of American capitalism." Furthermore, I reminded him that the NEA had never elected a Communist

President as the NUT had done, or sent a Communist as a spokesperson to international meetings as the NUT had done at Endicott, or elected Communist Party members to its Executive Committee.

The conversation was growing quite warm at this point and it is probably just as well that morning tea and Ralph Morley arrived simultaneously to interrupt our discussion. A few minutes later Mr. Morley told me not to worry, that NUT approval of WOTP would probably occur "soon" and without great difficulty. Thus encouraged by the NUT President, we all proceeded to the NUT Executive Meeting. In the light of what President Morley had just said to me, I spoke in general terms of professional unity and international understanding. The Executive listened politely, shouted "hear, hear" occasionally and applauded. After my remarks they turned to their regular agenda and I departed.

The NUT General Conference met at Easter in 1947 but it decided (contrary to President Morley's prediction) only "to develop existing international organizations"–an extremely ambiguous directive.

The Draft Constitution of WOTP was not approved by the important teachers' organizations of Argentina, Belgium, France, and Russia. None of these organizations had a representative at Endicott. The Belgians sent a message of good will. The French teachers agreed to send a delegate but at the last minute cabled an unexplained change in plans. The Argentine Teachers Organization had apparently disappeared when Colonel Peron took power after a military revolution in 1943.

I have already related my failure to reach the French teachers in any useful manner. Mr. Morley visited Paris for the same purpose and with equivalent results.

The great enigma

As for the Russians, they remained the "riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma," as described by Winston Churchill. At the UNESCO Constitutional Conference in London, in November, 1946, when I perceived that the Soviet Union would not send a delegation, I reluctantly wrote: "With the Soviet Union participating, UNESCO might well become a bridge; without it, UNESCO may become a wall." I began in 1947 to feel the same difficulty in regard to WOTP.

In March 1946, speaking in New York City before the American Association of School Administrators, I warned that the idealism of the American educator should not blind us to current realities. I recalled that between the world wars while American schools were teaching peace, the schools of other countries had been teaching just the opposite. "Our eyes were fixed upon the stars and we did not see the stumbling blocks at our feet." We should now, I said, temper idealism with a realistic appraisal of the direction in which world events were then moving. Incidentally, on that same day Winston Churchill, speaking at Fulton, Mo., called urgently for Anglo-American cooperation, and warned a "haggard world" that "from Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic an iron curtain has descended."

In July 1946, a "World Educational Conference" was assembled in Paris under somewhat obscure auspices. The NEA, nevertheless, sent an observer who described the spirit of this meeting as "left wing, pro-Russian, and pre-war communist." Nevertheless, the Russian teachers boycotted the Paris meeting just as they had recently boycotted UNESCO and would soon boycott Endicott. It was a bad time to seek Russian cooperation in almost anything. As the United Nations Secretary-General Trygve Lie wrote in his memoirs, "the cleavage between East and West appeared in 1946 and became a permanent feature of the international landscape in the course of 1947."

There were other obstacles, some small and some large, along the road to unity among the world's teachers. Perhaps the most important of these was the custom throughout almost all of Europe to keep the elementary and secondary teachers separate. Scotland and the German state of Bavaria provided the only important exceptions to this long-established schism. This separation was directly counter to the basic educational policy of almost all the rest of the world, including the large national teachers' organizations of the United States, Canada, Japan, Indonesia, the Philippines, Australia, and many others.

The two international organizations in Europe were commonly known by their acronyms: IFTA (elementary school teachers) and FIPESO (secondary). They were not prepared to close up shop and allow their national members to join WOTP. Neither of them had any serious chance of becoming significant world organizations. Within their limitations of geographic scope and educational level, however, they were performing a useful service. Their suggestion for achieving world unity was that the United States, Canada, and Australia, for example, should split their members into elementary and secondary groups, each to affiliate with its appropriate international body, IFTA or FIPESO as the case might be. Leaders of IFTA and FIPESO had played heroic parts in resistance to the special oppression which the Nazi invaders had inflicted on teachers. These common memories produced a further momentum to the onward movement of these organizations.

In short, if WOTP were to include most of the European teachers it would be necessary somehow to continue IFTA and FIPESO within the same framework. To do this the Constitution written at Endicott would have to be extensively modified. All this did not become clear in one flash of insight. It was a conclusion reached tentatively and over a period of years. Meanwhile WOTP itself must continue to serve its purposes and to gain in areas other than Europe,—and to whatever limited degree was possible within Europe also. Thus we approached the 1947 meeting in Glasgow.

In 1947 the separate meetings of IFTA and FIPESO were also held in Scotland, in Edinburgh and in the week immediately preceding the WOTP meeting in Glasgow. In spite of Sir Frederick Mander's prediction, the Scots had not copied the English arm's length policy toward WOTP. Rather, the Scottish Education Institute and its officials joined WOTP, invited it to meet in Glasgow, and put forth great effort to make the meeting successful.

Scottish support in a crisis

But first everybody was invited to meet informally at Edinburgh on the day which intervened between the closing sessions of IFTA-FIPESO and the opening session in Glasgow of WOTP. I have seldom attended a more frustrating session. IFTA had already voted by a comfortable margin not even to send an observer to the Glasgow meeting of WOTP. It had been formally moved that "IFTA does not wish to affiliate with WOTP." The Scottish delegation offered an amendment to add the words "for the present" to the motion. The amendment was defeated 26-19 and the motion without the amendment was carried 41-4. Then, just to clinch the nail, it was voted (24-7) that "during the coming year there shall be no cooperation between IFTA and WOTP."

The spokesperson for IFTA, Louis Dumas of France, folded his arms in Napolenic fashion, glared at the WOTP delegates, and said, "I have nothing to discuss, nothing to say." And, of course, with the motions having been enacted as just described, he was really obliged to be silent. Enforced silence, I have discovered, is a painful restraint for me or any other teacher, and especially for a French teacher. But M. Dumas bore it bravely.

Thus repulsed, we proceeded to Glasgow. WOTP could rely on only one teachers' organization in all of Europe at that time. That was the Educational Institute of Scotland. Miss Margaret Pringle of EIS had presided over the committee in Endicott to draft the WOTP Constitution. When we came to decide where in Europe to hold the 1947 Delegate Assembly only one country, Scotland, offered to serve as host. Miss Pringle and the General Secretary of EIS, Alexander Belford, made all arrangements.

When, in 1969, the EIS took the unusual step of conferring on me the degree of Fellow of the Institute (I believe only three or four EIS Fellowships have been awarded outside of the United Kingdom), I took great pleasure in acknowledging to the degree-granting Convocation that the progress and perhaps the existence of WOTP was due to EIS. "If the enthusiasm of the United States teachers was the rocket that moved WOTP off the launching pad, it was the goodwill and persistence of the EIS that put it into orbit."

Glasgow, 1947

The Glasgow Conference in itself was long on constitutional debate and short on action. It could hardly have been otherwise. Only seven national members were represented by delegations. The National Union of Teachers of England and Wales sent only observers who proposed many constitutional amendments. These changes were minor in character, usually more to clarify than to modify. It was also agreed that the 1949 annual Delegate meeting should be a constitutional assembly to review experience to date and to amend the Constitution if necessary without the formality of a ninety-day notice.

The Assembly agreed to give all-out support to the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund, and to work closely with UNESCO in educational relief and reconstruction. Five topics were selected for reports in the 1948 meetings and responsibility for collection of materials from members and the compilation of reports assigned to the national member (or in one case to the national observer) from the countries indicated:

International Language (Switzerland)
Interchange of Pupils and Teachers (Scotland)
Social Studies and Current Affairs (United States)
Literacy Extension (China)
Health Education (England)

A meticulous budget of anticipated income and expense was prepared by a Conference Committee and adopted by the Assembly. It must be confessed, however, that as far as the income side of the budget was concerned, generous measures of faith, hope, and charity were used. We had at the moment $858.50 in the Treasury.

The Nominating Committee did an excellent job. As the first President of WOTP, it proposed William F. Russell, Dean of Teachers College, Columbia University, with a distinguished career in international relations; member of the China Education Commission in 1921-22, Chairman of the NEA Delegation to the World Federation of Education Associations Conferences of 1925 and 1927, and a member of the NEA Committee on International Relations. I must confess that I was not enthusiastic; I felt sure that Dean Russell would consider leadership of such a small organization *infra dig* and that if he did accept he would not really immerse himself in the actual work of the organization. I was in error on both counts. He accepted the election promptly and his leadership for the next five years was brilliant, generous, and completely devoted.

Other Executive Committee members elected were: Margaret Pringle (Educational Institute of Scotland), K.T. Ma (a veteran of the Endicott meeting, Chairman of National Child Education Association of China), Kazimierz Maj (Polish Teachers Union, first organization to ratify the WOTP Constitution; member of the Polish Delegation at the 1946 Assembly of UNESCO where he ably and fully demonstrated his direct concern for WOTP and cooperation between it and UNESCO) and Otto Miller (Canadian Teachers Federation representative at Endicott).

Although two Executive Committee members as well as the new President, Dr. Russell, were absent from Glasgow, the rest of us held a follow-up meeting and made some decisions which were later submitted to the absent members by mail. I was appointed Secretary-General. The invitations to join WOTP were to be re-issued. A newsletter was to be issued from time to time. An effort would be made to arrange a teachers' organization meeting during the November 1947, General Conference of UNESCO in Mexico City.

Thus at the end of the Glasgow meeting we had a fairly hopeful situation for educational cooperation. We had an education-conscious United Nations and we had UNESCO. Public Law 584, 79th Congress (more commonly known as the Fulbright Act) had been enacted in 1946 and was in the first stages of its operation. After I wrote, in September 1946, the first circular letter on the subject to school superintendents in the United States, the Anglo-American teacher-exchange program was re-established on a small scale. Prospects for the expansion of these international teacher exchanges were encouraging. And we had WOTP, shaky in its support but determined in its purposes.

Unfortunately the international political climate was flawed by the Soviet refusal to join its wartime allies in building the peace. President Truman described this Kremlin policy as "one of the greatest disappointments of our time." The Iron Curtain had descended, the Cold War was a familiar phrase, and the Soviet Union had refused to participate in both the Marshall Plan for European rehabilitation and in the Baruch proposals in the United Nations for immediate, complete, and mutual atomic disarmament.

These political difficulties did not, in themselves, prevent a considerable growth toward international teacher unity. The greatest obstacle remained the traditional European distinction between the elementary and secondary levels of education and the consequent chasm which, however politely hidden from view, separated the elementary and secondary school teachers. Some way had to be found to bridge that abyss, and we began to seek a way to build that bridge immediately after the Glasgow conference. It was to take us all of five years to construct it.

Executive Committee activity

WOTP President William F. Russell was 57 years of age when he was elected to that office in Glasgow. He had been for 20 years the Dean of Teachers College, Columbia University. His entire life had equipped him for leadership in international education. The College had recently employed an Assistant Dean to enable Dr. Russell to devote more time, energy, and travel (at his own expense) to the cause of unity among teachers. Under his Presidency, the Executive Committee of WOTP held 22 meetings in five years.

Much WOTP business was transacted incident to the travels of the Executive. For example, in 1951-52, Dr. Russell visited the General Conferences of the NUT, the EIS, the Ulster Teachers Union, and the Irish National Teachers Organization. Another member of the Executive Committee attended an international meeting of Catholic teachers in Rome. Another member represented WOTP in Italy and Holland. Still another became a member of the Indian cultural delegation to mainland China and a representative to the UNESCO Conference in Bangkok. My own itinerary included contact with teachers in Austria, Denmark, Egypt, France, Germany, and Iceland.

In the case of the German teachers, fairly extensive efforts were made. In August 1949, I was invited by the United States Occupation Forces to serve as a consultant on educational policies. While doing so I met with German educators in several cities in the American zone. A second visit to Germany was made under the same auspices in September 1951, and I have returned to Germany on seven occasions since then.

The European office of WOTP was located in Edinburgh under the direction of Alexander Belford from 1947 until his untimely death in 1952. The headquarters office was in Washington where I was allowed by the NEA to spend as much overtime as I wished on WOTP work. Beginning in 1950, the organization also had one paid employee, Miss Beryl Parke, who worked with great diligence and sacrifice until she resigned in 1958. Miss Parke's earlier experience as a language teacher and as a staff member of the Institute of International Education was invaluable to WOTP.

The outlook after Glasgow

After Glasgow, the development of WOTP in various parts of the world may be summarized as follows:

Western Europe

In 1948 the National Union of Teachers of England and Wales became a member, and the 1948 General Conference was held in

London. The fact that the NUT included both primary and secondary teachers facilitated the process of affiliation. The Iceland and Malta Teachers Unions also joined WOTP in 1948, the Association of Secondary School Teachers in Finland in 1949, the women teachers' organization of Norway and the Italian Federation of Middle School Teachers in 1950, and the Irish National Teachers Organization (Eire) in 1952.

On the other side of the ledger, the important teachers organizations of France, Belgium, Sweden, Denmark, and Germany remained, although invited at least once a year, outside WOTP.

The Communist bloc

Daniel Prescott, after two months in a UNESCO seminar in Prague in 1948, remarked that even among teachers "thought control comes with extraordinary swiftness."

In July, 1948, I received a letter from Professor Prihoda, one of the two Czechoslovak delegates at Endicott and a staunch supporter of WOTP. After February (the date of the coup d'etat) he wrote, "conditions have changed in every way so that it is impossible to expect that the teachers in new democracies could collaborate with those in the less progressive countries (in the political sense, of course). All your endeavors along that line are in vain. It would be good if you could come to this country to see for yourself the deep difference. . ."

A few weeks later, in August 1948, I had another disheartening letter from Kazimierz Maj and Witold Wilkowski, Chairmen of the "Department of Collaboration Abroad." Mr. Maj, whose organization had been among the first to ratify the WOTP Constitution, who had strongly urged that UNESCO cooperate with WOTP, who had been elected to a term on the WOTP Executive, wrote that the Polish Teachers Union now belonged to the Federation of Trade Unions in Poland. This Federation, he continued, "allows the Polish Teachers Union to belong only to the World Federation of Trade Unions–Department of Education." So Poland, too, was out of WOTP.

Asia

It was in 1948 also that WOTP communication with China came to an end. The Bamboo Curtain had fallen.

The All-Burma Teachers Union became a member of WOTP in 1949 but the country was even then becoming increasingly isolated. Within a year the new membership was withdrawn and except for a few rare and unexpected appearances of observers at Delegate Assemblies, the Burmese teachers might as well have been located on the moon for all the contact they had with other national organizations.

The All-India Federation of Education Associations is a vast inchoate assemblage of dozens of regional and specialized organizations. Its leadership did pull itself together in 1949 long enough to request and accept national membership in WOTP. It contributed to WOTP a valued Executive Committee member and, an excellent Vice-President. It later never had resources which would approximate its correct financial contribution. With some grumbling by member organizations which pay their full dues, the AIFEA has remained a member of the world organization. On occasion a few of the Indian state organizations of teachers have been briefly carried on the roll of the Soviet-controlled international organization of teachers' unions. Grants-in-aid supplied to the AIFEA by WOTP and by the National Education Association are as effective as a single raindrop in the midst of a Sahara of need. Some of the most able advisors from the Western world have worked long and patiently to assist the Indians but they have produced few lasting results.

In 1950 the Philippine Public School Teachers Association and the All-Ceylon Union of Teachers became WOTP members. The former has remained one of the pillars of the world's teachers' organization. The Ceylon organization is very small and is only one of a large number of teachers' organizations in Sri Lanka. At one time there were over 20 national teachers' organizations competing for membership in this one small island. Numerous visits to Ceylon were made by representativees of WOTP but no progress was made towards an effective united profession or even cooperation.

In 1951 WOTP enrolled two large and powerful members in the Far East–the Korean Federation of Education Associations and the Japan Teachers Union. Both of these organizations, although they differed considerably one from another, remained solid, solvent, well-administered, active members which contributed capable members to the WOTP Executive and helped to shape the WOTP program as well as to execute parts of it.

Middle East and Africa

The teachers' organizations in Egypt and Turkey joined WOTP in 1950 and 1951, respectively. They were followed by the Israel Teachers Union in 1952.

Through the activities of the Edinburgh office, the Nigeria Union of Teachers was affiliated to WOTP in 1948 and the National Teachers Association of Liberia joined in 1952.

The Americas

In no part of the world was WOTP less effective than in Latin America. Bolivia's teachers' organization was represented at Endicott and became affiliated in 1947. The Brazil Education Association and the National Union of Teachers of Haiti, both also represented at Endicott, joined in 1948. The National Union of Teachers of Ecuador joined in 1950.

The Syndicate of Teachers in Mexico returned from signing the Endicott documents and within a year affiliated themselves with the Soviet-sponsored international organization, an arrangement which continues to this day.

In the other countries of Latin America, lack of political stability, the close identification of teachers with national politics, and a chronic divisiveness among teachers kept the membership down.

Even the few affiliations that did exist in this vast area left a good deal to be desired. The Brazil Education Association had practically no activities outside of Rio de Janeiro. Rarely was it possible for delegates from Latin America to attend a WOTP meeting unless someone else paid their travel expenses–and WOTP unfortunately was seldom able to do that.

Although the support of the National Education Association of the United States was constant and generous, the NEA tried to avoid smothering the new organization or allowing it to appear (as some professed to fear) an instrument of American foreign policy.

Throughout this period,–and down to the present day –the Canadian Teachers Federation never failed to offer steadfast support, and the Canadians were effective and generous hosts to WOTP in 1950.

London and the search for unity, 1948

The 1948 Assembly of WOTP met in London. The adherence of NUT was accompanied by a proviso that every effort should be made to unify IFTA, FIPESO and WOTP. Accordingly, immediately after the adjournment of the London meeting I went to Interlaken, Switzerland to meet with representatives of IFTA and FIPESO. Again, as at Edinburgh, I encountered a rancorous hostility from people who, for differing reasons, were united in their desire that WOTP would not succeed. It was, in fact, difficult for me to gain access to their meetings, even as a sincerely interested but silent and non-voting observer. I persevered, however, and with the help of some of the participants, especially the Scots, I was admitted to the meetings and, later, very cautiously, to a discussion of unity. In that discussion a suggestion emerged that a joint constitutional committee be established by the three organizations. No firm decision was made and the idea was left to soak in. In August, 1949, Dr. Russell travelled to Stockholm where FIPESO and IFTA agreed to establish a joint committee with five members representing each of the three organizations.

The Committee of Fifteen met that November in Paris, again in April, 1950, and finally in November, 1951. The negotiations were extremely difficult. We had to have some agreement in order that WOTP could survive in Europe. On the other hand it seemed increasingly clear to me that the other two organizations had little genuine interest at that point in activities beyond the boundaries of Europe. Over the decades they had developed the comfortable habit of meeting in one European country after another—sometimes in the capital city, sometimes in a vacation spot. Between these meetings there was no extensive activity.

The Committee of Fifteen meetings were prolonged and difficult. Substantial compromise was necessary. Constant care was required because a few members of the Committee of Fifteen did not wish the joint effort to succeed.

In the end, however, we compiled a report in the form of a Constitution which all fifteen members signed. Briefly, it was a merger of three organizations into an entity to be called the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession (WCOTP) in which IFTA and FIPESO were to be constituent federations. All national organizations currently in membership of any one of the international organizations would automatically become members of WCOTP. National organizations which enrolled only elementary school teachers would become members of both WCOTP and IFTA. National organizations which enrolled only secondary school teachers would become members of both WCOTP and FIPESO. National organizations which included both elementary and secondary teachers would have the option: (a) to join WCOTP directly without joining either IFTA or FIPESO, or (b) to divide their membership between IFTA and FIPESO and thus belong to all three organizations.

There was more, much too much more. Suffice it to say that the new Constitution would be submitted to the three Delegate Assemblies in the summer of 1951. If approved by all of them, the WCOTP would become operative immediately upon the adjournment of the three Assemblies in Copenhagen in August 1952.

The Committee of Fifteen included two members from the United States (Dr. Russell and myself), four from France, six from the United Kingdom, two from Switzerland, and one from Sweden.

Berne, 1949

Meanwhile the 1949 meeting of WOTP was held in Berne, Switzerland. It was a relatively small conference with resources limited largely to the time and energy Dr. Russell, WOTP Vice-President F. Sack who lived in Berne, Alexander Belford, and I could devote to it. The principal theme was "Tenure, Salary, and Retirement Provisions for Teachers." A great deal of attention was also devoted to the next steps along the road to unity with IFTA and FIPESO. As at Glasgow and London in the preceding years, I was the sole member of the secretariat, responsible for meeting rooms, hotel accommodations, transport, documents, translation and interpretation, records both financial and managerial, minutes, and publications, as well as for the more lofty duties of proposing program and policy to the Executive Committee.

In spite of all handicaps I felt sure at Berne for the first time that WOTP would survive. In 1965, after the Addis Ababa Assembly of WCOTP, my wife and I decided to return home via Berne—a sentimental journey—partly to see again Dr. Sack and his wife and partly to revisit the city which we both remembered as the place where we became sure that WOTP would succeed. We stayed in the same room of the same hotel as in 1949. We made our way to the room where the 1949 meeting had been held. We were both startled to find that the room was *so small*. In Addis Ababa in 1965 the participants from 85 national teachers' organizations and from 13 international organizations had filled all the places in the great Africa Hall so that some delegates had to be assigned to the balcony. In Berne in 1949 the small room just off the hotel lobby had been only partly filled by representatives of only 15 national organizations (of which only 11 were WOTP members) and of only four international organizations. In total attendance the meeting in Addis Ababa was more than five times as large as that of the Berne meeting only 16 years earlier.

Ottawa, 1950

The 1950 meeting of WOTP was held in Ottawa, the first meeting since Endicott on the North American continent. The theme of the meeting was the Public Relations of the Teaching Profession.

Among other decisions, an international comparative study on teachers' salaries was authorized. When it appeared in print two years later that study, made for WOTP by Eugene Hammer, was the first monograph publication on this topic. As far as I know, it is still the only volume on its subject.

The Ottawa conference debated in great detail the early draft report of the Committee of Fifteen and reiterated the instructions that the WOTP Delegation to the Committee of Fifteen persevere in efforts to reach an acceptable solution.

A novel feature of the Ottawa meeting was introduced by Dr. Russell in the form of three public lectures on:

Practical Goals for an International Teachers Association, by William G. Carr
Teachers behind the Iron Curtain, by George S. Counts
Education in a Free Society, by William F. Russell

Dr. Russell in a brilliant address drew a parallel between epidemic disease (such as the Black Plague of the Fourteenth Century) and the insidious political "germs" which have in the past destroyed free societies and which continue to threaten freedom today.

Dr. Counts said that the purposes of education in the Soviet Union are to develop three loyalties: (1) to the motherland; (2) to Lenin's doctrine and the Communist Party; (3) to the person of Marshal Stalin.

As for my speech, I proposed six practical goals for WOTP:

1. To develop among young people the attitudes and understandings that would help make war less likely
2. To defend the freedoms and rights of children and teachers everywhere
3. To develop a small efficient WOTP staff to serve its member organizations
4. To strengthen teachers' organizations and to help create such organizations in countries where none existed
5. To set before the world an example of unity in the teaching profession
6. To perfect the structure of the world organization

Malta, 1951

The Fifth Delegate Assembly of WOTP took place in Valetta, Malta in 1951. By this time the work of the Committee of Fifteen was almost finished and a final vote was taken on the acceptance of the new Constitution of WCOTP. The Conference theme –how national teachers' organizations should help their members to become better teachers–was vigorously and helpfully discussed, but the imminence of the "merger" made the constitutional questions of unusual concern. Almost everyone there was dissatisfied with one or more aspects of the new Constitution. My good friend and colleague, George Croskery, Secretary of the Canadian Teachers Federation, spoke not only for Canada but also for many other delegates in saying that he was opposed to a Confederation, but he wanted an influential one. No organization was fully satisfied with the draft. It would mean less money for a greatly expanded program. IFTA and FIPESO would maintain their identity unchanged while WOTP would have to be reformed as WCOTP, and national associations that did not accept or desire the division between elementary and secondary teachers would be restricted to the discussion of general issues. The delegations lined up about as follows:

To adopt the WCOTP Constitution: the national WOTP members in Scotland, India, United States, England and Wales, Ulster, Switzerland, Philippines, Norway.

Not to adopt: Canada, Malta, Ceylon, Iceland.

Not speaking in this part of the discussion: Haiti, Japan.

Towards the end of the discussion, which extended over most of two days, George Croskery paid me a great personal compliment and simultaneously put me on the spot. He said, in substance, that he wanted to hear the personal views of the Secretary-General. This was a difficult question for me because I fully shared many of the doubts that he and others had already expressed. I also felt sure that if I opposed the measure other votes would swing to the opposition. I replied that the Confederation was the only route by which we could in the foreseeable future obtain the cooperation of most of the important teachers' organizations of Europe. These organizations could have joined WOTP in 1946 or 1947 if they had not heeded a great deal of bad advice. Circumstances have to be faced as they exist, not as the way we wish they might have been. If WOTP now rejected the WCOTP draft Constitution, the entire responsibility for continued disunity would be placed, however unjustly, on WOTP. Every speaker recognized the defects in WCOTP but there are times when the spirit of the law is more important than the text of the law. This was one of those occasions. On balance, I believed the WCOTP Constitution should be approved.

9 WCOTP: 1953, 1954, 1955, 1956

Copenhagen, 1952–Organization meeting - Schedule of major meetings, 1953-1972; Oxford, 1953–Associate members - Spanish observers - Dues and voting - Home and school - Return via Seoul Oslo, 1954–Education of teachers - A World organization - Future meetings; Istanbul, 1955–Fiscal problems - Communist teachers' organizations - Status of teachers, a continuing concern - Regional surveys - Teachers Charter–Disseminating the Recommendation Manila, 1956–Community schools - Summary of AID observations - The Caribbean - Central America–Aid in Asia–Along the way

My final words to the last session of WOTP in Copenhagen on July 31, 1952 were entitled, "Looking Forward." I wanted to stress that during the past seven years in the work of WOTP we had written a page of educational history. The page bore many blots, errors, and corrections. Tomorrow, I said, we shall be given a clean new page. In the writing of this new page we should take advantage of past mistakes and successes.

COPENHAGEN, 1952

Organization meeting

About 24 hours later the newly-elected Executive Committee of WCOTP invited me to become its Secretary-General for an indefinite term "at the pleasure of the Executive Committee." I accepted and began a service to WCOTP which ran until I resigned in July 1970. I was then elected President of WCOTP for the usual two-year term. Thus, adding also the six years with WOTP, I served the organized teachers of the world for a total of 26 years.

Schedule of major meetings, 1953-72

Here, for the record, are the cities in which the Annual Assembly of Delegates of WCOTP met; and the central themes of the meetings:

1953 (Oxford)–Parent-Teacher Co-operation
1954 (Oslo)–Education for Teaching
1955 (Istanbul)–Status of the Teaching Profession
1956 (Manila)–The Teacher and the Well-being of Society
1957 (Frankfort)–Teacher Shortage
1958 (Rome)–Public Support for Education
1959 (Washington)–Mutual Appreciation of Eastern and Western Cultural Values
1960 (Amsterdam)–Child Health and the School
1961 (New Delhi)–Education for Responsibility
1962 (Stockholm)–Education in a Technical Age
1963 (Rio de Janeiro)–Conditions of Work for Quality Teaching
1964 (Paris)–Increasing International Understanding Through Teaching About the United Nations
1965 (Addis Ababa)–Equal Opportunity Through Education
1966 (Seoul)–Teachers Organizations in Educational Planning
1967 (Vancouver)–Professional Responsibilities of Teachers Organizations
1968 (Dublin)–Education and Human Rights
1969 (Abidjan)–Teachers Organizations and Assistance to Developing Countries
1970 (Sydney)–Qualities of a Teacher
1971 (Kingston)–Rural Education*
1972 (London)–The Articulation of Elementary, Secondary, and Higher Education

In addition to the above list, during those same years, WCOTP regional conferences or other WCOTP-related activities took me to many other places, including:**

---

*I missed the Jamaica meeting because of serious illness.

**Regional conferences of WCOTP in which I did not personally participate are omitted.

1952: Brussels, Belgium
Luxembourg, Luxembourg

1953: Tokyo, Japan (also in 1956, 1966, 1971)
Pusan, Korea
Belfast, Northern Ireland
Edinburgh, Scotland (also in 1969)

1955: Athens, Greece (also in 1969)
Tel Aviv, Israel
Beirut, Lebanon (also in 1968, 1969)
Cairo, United Arab Republic (also in 1963, 1965, 1968, 1969)

1956: Colombo, Kandy, and Jaffna, Ceylon
Taipei, Republic of China (also in 1971)
Havana, Cuba (also in 1957)
San Salvador, El Salvador
Guatemala, Guatemala
Tegucigalpa, Honduras
Hong Kong, Hong Kong (also in 1961)
Jaipur, India
Lahore and Karachi, Pakistan
Panama City, Panama
Baguio, Philippines
Bangkok, Thailand

1957: Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic (also in 1965)
Wurzburg and Bonn, Germany
Port-au-Prince, Haiti

1958: Geneva, Switzerland (also in 1959, 1966, 1967)
Ottawa, Canada
Belgrade, Dubrovnik, and Split, Yugoslavia

1959: Halifax, Canada
Mexico City, Mexico (also in 1962, 1963, 1964, 1966, 1968)

1960: San Jose, Costa Rica
Queretaro, Mexico

1961: Berlin, Germany (also in 1964)
Djakarta and Bandung, Indonesia (also in 1969)

1962: São Paulo, Brazil
Lima, Peru
Port-of-Spain, Trinidad (also in 1969)

1963: Cozumel, Mexico

1964: Munich, Germany
Guadalajara, Mexico

1965: Nairobi, Kenya
Alexandria, United Arab Republic (also in 1969)

1966: Bogota, Colombia
Nagano, Japan

1967: Hamilton, Bermuda

1968: Baghdad, Iraq
Killarney, Ireland

1969: Accra, Ghana
Madras and Bombay, India
Teheran, Iran (also 1973)
Dakar, Senegal
Tunis, Tunisia

1970: Melbourne, Launceston, and Hobart, Australia
Eastbourne and London, England
Nandi, Fiji
Hamilton, Wellington, Christchurch, and Invercargill, New Zealand
Papeete, Tahiti

1971: Taichung, Taiwan, Republic of China

1972: Morges, Switzerland

OXFORD, 1953

The first annual Assembly of Delegates of WCOTP was marked by three serious controversies. I have observed that uncomfortable delegates are often quarrelsome delegates, and the facilities at Oxford, both for living and for meeting, left much to be desired. The format of the meeting was unfamiliar to some of the delegates. We still lacked simultaneous translation and we asked bilingual members of various delegations to volunteer as interpreters because we could not afford to employ professionals.

Associate members

A number of NEA state affiliates had been *associate* members of WOTP. Since associate members could not vote it seemed clear that the only purpose of such a relationship was to have the state affiliates attend the meeting as observers, to distribute first-hand information about WCOTP, and to contribute financially to the world organization. When a number of these state associations applied for WCOTP associate membership, the French delegation strenuously objected. Although the arrangement was fully in accord with the text of the WCOTP Constitution, which the French teachers' organization had helped to draft and had voted to approve, they feared some kind of trick to give the United States teachers a stranglehold on the new organization. In the end, after repeated reassurances, the French delegation decided to abstain.

These associate members have been joined by others in the ensuing years and still constitute an important source of strength for the Confederation.

Spanish observers

I had circulated in the customary way a preliminary list of delegates, observers, and visitors at the meeting. On that list were the names of two young men designated by the Servicio Español del Magisterio of Spain. I had met representatives of this Servicio in Madrid in 1951 and had invited them to visit and observe the WOTP meeting in Copenhagen in 1952 as well as the WCOTP meeting in Oxford in 1953. I knew quite well that no independent organization of teachers could exist in Spain. However, I also thought that they might profit from the meetings and pick up a few ideas about independent teachers' organizations in the process. They were observers and would not have the right to the floor or to vote. They were seated in the visitors' balcony.

The storm warning flags went up when the chief French delegate, noting the presence of the Spaniards, announced that his delegation could not continue to deliberate in the presence of these observers.

The WCOTP President explained that the Executive Committee was carrying out the wishes of all members when it invited all national teachers' organizations to send observers to the Assembly. He said that there were several other countries whose presence might be objectionable to certain other delegations.

The French refused to reconsider.

The President then suggested that the matter be referred to the Executive Committee.

The dissident French rose to leave the hall, together with the delegations from Yugoslavia, Luxembourg, and two of the three delegations from Belgium.

Because the Oxford Union where we were meeting is furnished with unusually long benches and few aisles, there was a good deal of difficulty and tripping before the last departing delegate was able to achieve extrication from the presence of the two Spanish observers in the balcony.

Out of a total of 174 accredited delegates, 28 withdrew (17 French and 11 others) leaving 84 percent still present.

The Spanish observers left by train for Paris early the next morning. Since they spoke no English and no French, and had no interpreter, it is doubtful whether they understood the nature of the discussion.

Dues and voting

The third fractious issue, although much more serious, was, as it turned out, resolved much more simply. Organizations in developing countries which are members of WCOTP could, if they wished, pay two percent of their budget as their membership fee rather than the usual fee of a fixed number of Swiss centimes per individual member. The best example of the application of this rule is the All-India Federation of Educational Associations. With 300,000 individual members, a world membership fee of $20.00 out of a total national budget of $1,000 was charged. This is really all the Indians could afford. If they were charged at the usual rate they would undoubtedly be obliged to withdraw. If their voting strength in the Confederation were to be reduced their great number of teachers would be offended. This problem had already been thoroughly discussed in drafting the WCOTP Constitution.

Nevertheless, the Netherlands delegation objected to the unfairness of this financial arrangement. Their views were supported by the French delegation, which had just returned in good health and

160

spirits from their Spanish boycott. Before the discussion could go much further, the delegate from India took the floor. He asserted his organization's constitutional right to pay the fees and control the votes assigned to it. But, he continued, the question of votes is not all that important. Without abandoning its right to the assigned number of votes, the Indian delegation would not vote at all. The Assembly, weary of argument over operating details, rose to applaud the Indian delegation. The President of WCOTP also expressed his appreciation, adding that a similar conciliatory attitude on the part of all members would greatly expedite and strengthen the Confederation.

Home and school

The Confederation's 1953 theme, "Parent-Teacher Cooperation," occupied most of the Oxford meeting. The Australian delegate said that Australian teachers would resent parental intrusion on the freedom of teachers and the choice of teaching methods. Parent-teacher cooperation in securing school equipment, however, was welcomed. Belgian and Swiss delegates said much the same thing but put it more delicately.

The NEA delegation, from the early days of WOTP, had always included the President of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers. Naturally, this lady did not admire the Australian teachers' viewpoint of "buy the equipment but keep out." However, she avoided a direct confrontation and offered a brief statement of the policy of PTA in her country. The delegate from Korea also spoke up for the needed help from parents in dealing with a wide variety of problems. For financial aid, she said, teachers should contact the fathers; for dealing with behavior problems, contact the mothers. The Philippines delegate spoke appreciatively of the help of parents to make available lightweight materials for temporary schools until the backlog of the school shortage could be reduced by more permanent construction.

The delegate from India said there are two equally undesirable parental attitudes: indifference and interference. There are also two kinds of teachers—those whose concern is limited to the classroom and those who take a more comprehensive view. Parent-teacher cooperation on a worthwhile scale requires, at least in India, a great increase in the number of teachers.

The Ceylon delegate said that her country had many problems but parent-teacher cooperation was not one of them. For the 90 percent of the population which lived in villages, parents and teachers worked together without feeling a need to formalize or organize their joint efforts.

The principal resolution on the Conference theme spoke of "the importance of cooperative relationships between parents and teachers and their mutual concern in the welfare of children. Such cooperative effort deserves every encouragement." The resolution was adopted, with the French delegations abstaining, for a reason that I have never understood.

Return via Seoul

After the Oxford meeting, my wife and I were preparing for a long-desired vacation in Cornwall. However, the American-Korean Foundation in New York telephoned to ask me to join a mission to Korea as the adviser on post-war educational reconstruction. The last thing I wanted at that time was to go to Korea, but I reflected that many other Americans had been sent to Korea recently under conditions far worse than I would face. Furthermore, I was advised that if I did not go to Korea education would not be represented in the mission. We cancelled our Cornwall plans and did not visit that delightful part of England until 1967. Instead, I had to catch up with the Korean mission. The almost continuous flight: London-Paris-New York-Los Angeles-Honolulu-Wake-Tokyo-Seoul was the longest I have ever made. I never want to make a longer one.

The mission included ten men with whom I was proud to be associated. Dr. Howard Rusk was in charge of medical and hospital rehabilitation, General Van Fleet was our chairman, and Eugene Taylor our administrative officer. As a side-trip we visited Panmunjon to watch the exchange of prisoners-of-war with General Maxwell Taylor as our guide. I visited colleges and schools in Seoul, Pusan, and other towns and villages—a memorable experience. I shall discuss Korean rehabilitation more fully in Chapter XII.

OSLO, 1954

The second WCOTP meeting was an immense improvement over the first. Except for the transaction of necessary business little else was discussed except the Conference theme—"The Education of Teachers."

We did suffer one long, dreary, and vexatious debate on the manner of determining a quorum for the transaction of business.

The French pointed out that the division of the French teachers into a number of separate syndicates meant that some organizations in countries where membership is more unified had more votes than the largest French Syndicate. The point was quite valid and within a few years the formula for allocating votes was modified.

Education of teachers

There was no shortage of controversy at Oslo, but it was mainly about issues in education rather than in politics or the relative power of the member organizations.

The focus of most discussion on the education of teachers was the admission of students to the institutions which educate teachers. For some delegations only those with extensive academic preparation and high academic achievement should be admitted to training. Others held that extensive and relevant practical experience should be among the criteria even if the applicants were older and less brilliant.

At Oslo we made considerable use of small groups for discussion purposes. One such group discussed the advisability of the same education for prospective elementary and secondary school teachers.

Another group considered whether and how teachers could achieve a status of self-regulation.

A WORLD organization

Perhaps the most important decision taken at the Oslo meeting was to meet in 1955 in Istanbul and in 1956 in Manila. Breaking out of the small circle of European cities was a traumatic experience for some members of IFTA and FIPESO. Yet it became almost self-evident that a *world* organization must put its activities into various parts of the world and that the expense of sending delegations to remote points was an absolute necessity.

Istanbul, as one delegate put it, "is so off to one side," but it was after all inside Europe, although on the very edge of *terras incognitas.*

But to some. Manila was absolutely impossible. "Do you realize how *far* it is from London to Manila?" one English leader asked me. "I do not know the mileage," I responded, "but I can tell you this: it is exactly the same as the distance from Manila to London."

The WCOTP had already adopted a geographical table, which was revised as required by changes in the membership. This was to insure that the Executive Committee members were drawn from all geographical areas of the WCOTP membership. The decisions for Istanbul and Manila now made it clear that a geographical table, although flexible, would insure that the influence of its annual, special, and regional meetings would also become global in scope.

ISTANBUL, 1955

Fiscal problems

The Istanbul meeting of WCOTP was marked by rather poor conference facilities for which high prices were charged, by high prices also for food and accommodations (unless the visitor was changing money on the black market), and by inadequate organization and preparation. For instance, I requested that the telephone in the meeting hall be activated for the duration of our meeting. The bill was several hundred dollars. It was claimed that the switchboard was broken and that it was necessary to install an entirely new switchboard. I refused to pay that one.

However, as sometimes happens in such cases, the difficulties were offset by the exertions of just two or three local teachers who gave all their time and energy to facilitate the meeting.

Substantively the Assembly was troubled by an unusual number of complex constitutional questions, with lengthy and spirited debates over issues that are now dead–issues which I therefore need not explain.

Communist teachers' organizations

One such issue, however, deserves mention because it is still alive. It concerns Soviet or other communist participation in WCOTP. The position of the National Education Association on this point had been quite consistent from the day we first announced the Endicott meeting plans. We wanted all teachers' organizations to take part as respected members. The Russians, on the other hand, wanted to influence teachers' organizations throughout the world, and especially in the developing countries. They were not, however, willing to do so in an organization in which the teachers of the United States played an important part. This is why they stayed away from Endicott, pressured the Czechs and Poles to withdraw from WOTP, organized world conferences of teachers every two or three years where the program provided for endless anti-American propaganda, and attacked the formation of WCOTP before, during, and after the Copenhagen meeting. This is why they had formed a new entity called the Comité d'Entente which included IFTA, FIPESO and FISE, the communist teachers' "world" organization. Through this Comite d'Entente, the communists could meet with many teachers' organizations and yet avoid the intrusion of United States delegations.

The Arab teachers' organizations were assiduously courted by FISE. The Cuban teachers worked diligently to establish cordial relations with the teachers of Latin American countries, especially those of Mexico and Chile. The competition for the goodwill of the new teachers' organizations of Africa has been keen for many years; thus far, WCOTP has stayed well in the lead.

Perhaps the finest tribute to the power of freedom in education and to the ability of WCOTP to mobilize and wield that power, is the amount of time and money that FISE and other communist organizations spend to exclude from WCOTP contact their own teachers and as many other teachers as possible.

Status of teachers: a continuing concern

The Istanbul Assembly theme was "The Status of Teachers" and from this meeting flowed the series of events which ended eleven years later in the UNESCO Recommendation on the Status of Teachers. At this point of origin, I will trace the evolution of that concept, abandoning for the time being the chronological record of WCOTP.

In the years since 1955 the membership of WCOTP expanded greatly, especially by the addition of national organizations in Asia, Africa and the Americas. Thus it appeared that the next step in application of the Istanbul Resolutions should involve regional activities as a prelude to comprehensive worldwide efforts.

In 1959, following an exploratory meeting in Nigeria, the World Confederation established a Commission on Educational Policy for

Africa. Next year, this Commission, meeting in Uganda, concluded that the status of the teaching profession must be clearly recognized by the teachers themselves, by governments and by the public.

Regional meetings for Asia and the Americas followed. These meetings were similar in purpose to the Commission on Educational Policy for Africa, but adapted to the needs of each region. Such meetings were held in Malaya with the Asian teachers' organizations and in Costa Rica for those of the Americas. Again, these meetings urged that plans for the use of education as a means of national development recognize the professional status of teachers.

Regional surveys

These early efforts in regional educational planning met with difficulties, because the facts concerning the status of teachers had not been assembled or distributed. Accordingly, in 1961 WCOTP initiated a series of regional surveys of the status of teachers, together with conferences to disseminate the findings and their application. The first of these surveys was carried out by WCOTP in 1961 in Africa with some financial assistance from UNESCO and the Ford Foundation. A former president of the Gambia Teachers Union, after study and travel in 26 African countries, compiled the pioneer study, *The Status of the Teaching Profession in Africa.*

The next step in Africa was taken in 1963 when WCOTP organized a conference in Niger. Here, for the first time in African history, government representatives and teacher leaders from many countries met with a team of WCOTP consultants to consider the teaching profession in Africa. The results of their conference were published by the World Confederation in a substantial *Handbook for Raising the Status of the Teaching Profession in Africa.*

In Asia the survey of the status of the teaching profession was carried out by the Director of the WCOTP Regional Office in India. This survey covered 14 Asian and Pacific countries, including Australia and New Zealand. After careful review by an expert meeting in New Delhi in 1963, with attendance from 13 countries, the report was published. As in Africa, the investigation was assisted by a contract with UNESCO. The expert meeting in New Delhi also prepared recommendations on the professional, academic, economic, and political status of teachers. These recommendations were printed, circulated to Ministries of Education throughout the area, and brought to the attention of the appropriate international organizations. The 1963 New Delhi meeting proposed that the regional Asian study be followed by national surveys. Several such studies have been promoted, the most extensive being the Survey of the Status of Teachers in each of the states of India.

Meanwhile, the WCOTP study of the Status of Teachers in the Americas was launched. A special consultant for the study traveled from Argentina to Canada and prepared a preliminary text on which comments from teachers' organizations and others were secured. The final report was published in 1964.

Early in 1966, a WCOTP representative visited 17 small countries and islands in the Caribbean to obtain information on the Status of the Teaching Profession. This was later published by the WCOTP office in Puerto Rico.

Meanwhile, the two WCOTP constituent federations were considering the status of their members within the primary and secondary school fields, respectively.

In addition, one of the international members of WCOTP, the International Council on Health, Physical Education and Recreation, cooperated by making a detailed international study of the status of teachers of health and physical education, and by publishing and distributing the results.

Teachers Charter

As the various reports were completed and distributed, contacts were maintained with the major inter-governmental organizations, and especially with UNESCO. It soon became clear that an international recommendation on this subject would be extremely helpful.

In 1947 the UNESCO General Conference called for a Teachers Charter. The few teachers' organizations whose representatives were participating in the 1947 session of UNESCO were enthusiastic in their support of this resolution. It was the one thing on which the group I assembled could agree. However, action was repeatedly postponed. The word "Education" in UNESCO's full title was not, I fear, perceived as having any significant connection with the grubby work of the ordinary classroom teacher. The fact that a Teachers Charter was one of the first defined and authorized projects for UNESCO was forgotten.

I regret to say that UNESCO did not become greatly interested in teachers until in 1958 the International Labor Organization called a meeting in Geneva on the Economic and Social Conditions of Teachers. Sir Ronald Gould, the President of WCOTP, was sent from Britain to the Geneva meeting and was promptly elected chairperson. A short time later UNESCO and ILO leadership decided to avoid competition in jurisdiction and other preparatory expert meetings were jointly sponsored by the two international agencies and met alternately at the two headquarters, Geneva and Paris.

WCOTP representatives played a prominent role in this entire series of meetings. In the Geneva meeting of 1963, the WCOTP Vice-President, Sri Natarajan (India), was elected chairperson. In the 1964 meeting in Paris, I was chosen chairperson. In the 1966 meeting in Geneva, Vice-President Natarajan was again elected chairperson while I served as chairperson of the Drafting Committee.

Later the same year, the Intergovernmental Conference on an International Recommendation Concerning the Status of Teachers was convened by UNESCO in Paris. I was honored by being elected its Rapporteur. I believe I astounded (and perhaps slightly annoyed) the Secretariat of UNESCO by making the role of Rapporteur something other than the faithful reflection of the conclusions of the Secretariat. In such meetings it often happens that the diligent Secretariat, with the clerical and reference materials fully at its service, actually writes all or nearly all of the report of the Rapporteur who then reads it to the Conference, somewhat as the British monarch presents the "Speech from the Throne" to a respectfully attentive Parliament. Meanwhile everyone knows that the monarch's speech down to the last syllable has been written by the Prime Minister and Cabinet.

I chose not to perform as Rapporteur in that way. I wrote the report of the Conference by hand in my tiny room at the Hotel Crillon. Although I could not, of course, modify the actual votes of the Conference I could choose the placement and emphasis of the various sections and in many cases select wording which supported what I believed the Conference Recommendation should contain.

A few observations on the Recommendation:

1. Educational systems differ so much that great care must be taken in the text and translations. In some countries education is locally administered; in others it is nationally administered. In some countries teachers are civil servants; in others they are not. In some, all teachers are public employees; in others, most teachers are privately employed. We often had to be content to formulate basic principles because detailed proposals would have been meaningless in some national situations.
2. There was general agreement that teachers' organizations should participate fully in the conduct of education. The Recommendation outlined the rights and responsibilities of teachers in this respect.
3. Like most extended documents the Recommendation had dictionary problems. The term "teachers," for instance, required much time to define and even more time to explain. It was decided that the term should include not only those who have teaching duties in the classroom but also head teachers, supervisors, inspectors, and counsellors, who contribute advice or assistance to the teaching process. It was reluctantly decided that college teachers should not be included.
4. The Recommendation underlined the need for continuing study and growth by members of the teaching profession and defined the responsibility of governments to encourage such study.
5. The Recommendation declared that teachers should be free to exercise all normal civic rights, including eligibility for public office, and that their use and enjoyment of these rights were in the public interest.
6. The Recommendation itself was a rather plodding document. I believe, however, that a certain eloquence was inherent in its subject matter. An international document which recognizes clearly that teaching is a skilled profession requiring special knowledge, acquired through serious study and maintained by continuing education, that teaching calls for a sense of personal and collective responsibility, as well as the exercise of independent judgment in the interests of those whom the profession serves–such a document is likely to be a significant force to improve education world-wide.

Disseminating the Recommendation

As soon as the Recommendation was adopted, WCOTP began a series of programs to acquaint teachers' organizations and their leaders with the content and background of the Recommendation and to help them implement it as completely and as rapidly as possible.

Thus within a month, I was attending in Bogota a WCOTP regional conference on the Status of Teachers in the Americas. More than 100 leaders of 16 nations made a detailed review of the Recommendation, analyzed the obstacles to its immediate application, and decided on suggestions for surmounting or removing these obstacles.

In Tokyo at almost the same time WCOTP members from Asia were applying the Recommendation to their problems and suggesting steps to be taken in each country.

After this digression to trace to its conclusion the decision taken by WCOTP eleven years before in Istanbul, we return to the chronological review of WCOTP activities.

MANILA, 1956

My outstanding memory of the Manila Delegate Assembly is the person of Ramon Magsaysay, President of the Republic. He did far more than offer the ritual address of welcome. He sent no representative; he came in person. The Manila meeting was, in fact, the first WCOTP meeting to be inaugurated by the Head of State. He returned during the Conference itself. And during a reception he gave for us at the Presidential Palace he spent a good two hours in intense conversation with delegates from various parts of the world. His untimely death a few months later in an airplane disaster deprived the Philippine Commonwealth of sorely-needed national leadership and destroyed both the wisdom and the idealism which leaders in all parts of the world had learned to expect from him. Asia would be different today if Magsaysay had lived. A wholehearted believer in freedom, he showed his sense of relative values in forcefully reminding our Assembly that teachers should make young people aware not only of the rights of democratic citizenship but also of the obligations entailed by that privilege.

This was the first WOTP-WCOTP meeting in Asia. I had been concerned about the level of attendance by the European members.

Fortunately I was able to secure from the Asia Foundation a grant to help WCOTP to assure European participation by partial subsidization of their travel expenses. I found it possible in subsequent years to secure other grants from the Asia Foundation, UNESCO, and from other organizations and foundations to increase the strength of the Confederation. The WCOTP itself responded at Manila by a 25 percent increase in the dues of member organizations.

Community schools

The Manila Conference theme was "The Teacher and the Well-Being of Society." Separate discussion groups were organized to deal with this relationship: (a) in industrialized areas, (b) in economically underdeveloped countries, (c) in rural communities, and (d) in urban areas.

The Philippine community-centered schools offered an excellent close-at-hand example of a major effort to enlist teachers in the Well-Being of Society. For this reason, the Conference spent three days in the field, visiting schools in a caravan of seven buses on the way to Baguio, site of the famed in-service teachers' training center in the Santo Tomas mountains.

The Assembly voted to accept the resignation from membership of the Netherlands Indies Teachers Association, an action intended to clear the way for the subsequent admittance of the Indonesian Teachers Association. Unfortunately a decade elapsed before the political situation in Indonesia permitted this affiliation.

The plenary session of WCOTP took place in the large hall of the Philippines capital building where the national legislature meets. At the entrance of that hall a prominent sign directed the legislators to leave their firearms and other weapons at the desk of the doorkeeper. We, of course, had no weapons to check (nor, I expect, do the legislators today). At any rate, the WCOTP Assembly was not free of fairly rancorous and quite lengthy debate on how to establish contact with the Communist teachers' organizations. The discussion ended with a vote (154 to 107) which referred the question to the Executive Committee.

During the four years I had by then served as Secretary-General, I do not believe I uttered a word at any Delegate Assembly except to make announcements necessary for the convenience of delegates and the conduct of Assembly business. Following the long discussions at Manila I felt that the Delegate Assembly was entitled to know the views of the Secretary-General. Accordingly I tried to make clear the following points, partly summarized and partly quoted *verbatim:*

1. The financial status of the Confederation was steadily improving.
2. Some increase in the Washington staff, in the quality of WCOTP publications, and in participation in other conferences might soon be possible.
3. In addition to funds, staff, publications, and meetings, one other new ingredient was essential. That missing ingredient was mutual confidence. Lacking this ingredient we should have to continue to spend time inordinately on questions of mechanics and structure and devote far too little time to progress towards WCOTP purposes.
4. Without mutual confidence little was possible; with it scarcely anything was impossible. Without it, new voting scales, new committees, or new rules of procedure would really not help very much.
5. Full mutual confidence had not been established in spite of the hospitality and good offices of the Philippine Government and the Philippine teachers.
6. Although time and more personal acquaintance would help, there was another obstacle to confidence which time and companionship would not so easily erase. That further obstacle was that in many countries teachers' organizations were not free. A teachers' organization that was the tool of the government under which it existed did not inspire, nor did it deserve, the confidence of free men and women. A teacher who was restricted in the search for truth, who was subservient to a philosophy imposed by force or fear was not able to cooperate well with teachers who enjoyed freedom from such controls. We who did enjoy freedom had a duty to examine very carefully the overtures of cooperation from teachers who were not free.

Summary of AID observations

In 1955, Dr. William F. Russell, President of Teachers College, Columbia University, was drafted by President Eisenhower to serve as Deputy Director of the United States AID Program. More than any of his predecessors or successors in AID, Dr. Russell frankly recognized that elementary and secondary schools were highly important in national development. He organized an Advisory Committee on elementary and secondary education, an almost unheard-of procedure. There are many education Advisory Committees in the United States government but one must search long to find among them any personnel or interest for anything below college level education. As a member of Dr. Russell's Advisory Committee I was asked to inspect the educational operations in the U.S. AID missions overseas and to make recommendations.

The Caribbean

In *Cuba,* no substantial organization of teachers existed in 1956. I wrote in my report that unorganized teachers might become organized as undesirable political or economic pressure groups, subject to the dangers of infiltration. I offered NEA cooperation to help form a responsible professional organization.

In *Jamaica,* the Teachers Union had been urgently invited to join FISE but had turned down the invitation on ideological grounds. They soon joined WCOTP.

Central America

Panama had the longest period of U.S. AID of any nation in the world. Yet the staff of the U.S. AID mission agreed, when asked, that if United States aid and personnel were withdrawn the Panamanian schools would retrogress very far and almost immediately.

The relation of Panama to the Canal Zone would seem to offer many opportunities to enrich the educational program in both places. However, as far as I could see, the two units had no exchange of ideas or of materials or of people. I deplored this mutual exclusion in my report. I think Panama-United States relations today would be far better if informal relations between the schools of the Zone and of the Republic had been encouraged.

Costa Rica, with the highest literacy rate of any of the Central American republics, employed more teachers than soldiers, and had one of the best national teachers' associations in the world.

In *Honduras* the United Fruit Company school at Zamorano was a good example of United States private enterprise using education for lifting standards of production. It offered a broad education and its graduates, as a matter of Company policy, were not accepted as Company employees in less than three years after graduation.

At Danli, near the Nicaragua border, after a day's jeep ride over bad roads, we saw one of the five "vacation" workshops provided by AID. In Honduras teachers could be employed after completing the *third* grade of elementary school. Even a "professionally trained" teacher, by local standards, was certificated at age 16, after a three-year "normal" school course, plus examinations, plus the teaching of one demonstration lesson. Many of the AID Workshop participants were in their fifties or older. They were learning some basic facts about nutrition, how to use the UNICEF dried milk, how to teach reading, children's games, and industrial arts. Their eagerness to learn and then to teach the children in the demonstration school and their sacrifices to attend the workshop were inspiring. So were the directors of the workshop, two young bilingual teachers on leave of absence from the public schools of Arizona.

In *El Salvador,* we found that illiteracy in the adult population was nearly two-thirds. Seventy percent of the primary school teachers had neither degrees nor diplomas from the primitive normal schools.

A visit to a primary school in Panchimilco was typical. This village is about ten miles from the capital city, or about one hour by jeep or car. Immediately beyond the paved streets of the city one encountered an extremely rough and steep road. The villagers carried their produce straight uphill to reach the flat area of the city market. This weekly trip to the city was the big social event in their lives. The village itself was a disorganized huddle of drab houses. The only exception was the house of God which was well built, spacious, white-washed, and, within, lavishly and lovingly decorated. The two-room school opened directly on the village "street" on one side and into a patio on the other. The furniture consisted of homemade benches. A piece of smooth wood, painted black, could be used, with difficulty, as a blackboard. Lessons consisted of lectures and illustrations by the teacher, which each child carefully wrote down in a tiny notebook. Each lesson was given back by the pupils orally almost immediately and would be given back again in writing at examination time.

The teachers' organization of El Salvador represented at Endicott had been disbanded and the delegate, reversing the career of Horace Mann, had deserted education to become a lawyer.

However, after diligent inquiry, I did somehow discover an Association limited to women teachers. The President of this "Solidaridad de Maestras" was the energetic principal of the Girls' Normal School. She told me that, although many efforts had been made over the past years to establish an inclusive teachers' organization in El Salvador, the women's organization was the only one to achieve continuity. She said her organization was limited to women because they were far less likely than men to become involved in politics and far more likely to attend to professional problems. The organization ran a cooperative through which medicines and other necessities could be bought by members at reduced prices. It also promoted foreign and domestic group tours for members at reduced rates. They also worked for better pay and security for teachers, she said.

As it happened I went directly from the office of the President of the "Solidaridad de Maestras" to the office of the Minister of Education. One of my first questions to him was whether a teachers' organization existed in El Salvador. He promptly answered in the negative. I asked him whether there might be a teachers' organization limited to women and he again said no. He added that there used to be a teachers' organization many years ago, but it had disbanded. He said that El Salvador teachers did not like to join organizations.

I do not believe that the Minister of Education was consciously misinforming me. Like many other education ministers he looked at education without thinking about teachers at all. They were taken for granted. And the idea that teachers could make any useful contribution to educational change would have startled him. It is an idea whose time will come, but not just yet.

This attitude affected the AID missions throughout most of Central America. The AID missions had specific instructions to work with governments. The governments as a rule had no contact with teachers or their organizations.

On reaching *Guatemala* we quickly became aware of considerable hostility to the United States. The following paraphrase from

Teachers World (Communist) indicates the line which FISE was diligently promoting.

> Guatemala was governed by a savage aristocracy. Great landowners and the Catholic Church ruled public life. The United Fruit Company owned ports, railways, most of the fertile land, and monopolized sea routes. There was complete domination. Candidates for national office must sacrifice national independence for Company support. Under Presidents Arevelo and Arbenz, there was an effort to change from a semi-colonial economy to independence. But then an army of 6,000 mercenaries of whom only 40 were Guatemalans, armed by the United States of America, and aided by traitors directed by the United States Embassy, proceeded to destroy Guatemalan democracy.

I saw two school buildings erected under the Arevelo and Arbenz regimes. Both were showplaces, built in a semicircle facing a magnificent view, with *two* rooms for each class–one for study and one for "activity."

A law in Guatemala required owners of large farms (fincas) to endow and maintain schools for the children of farm workers. The United Fruit Company, I was told, met these requirements very well. Guatemalan landowners complied grudgingly if at all.

I found the leadership in the Ministry of Education intelligent, amiable, and disorganized. This was indeed the condition of most ministries of education we visited. Long lines formed before the doors to the Minister's offices. I was told that they each had problems which only the Minister could decide. Teachers asking to be transferred to another school, and parents who wanted to enroll their children in another school, made up the bulk of the waiting lines. All wait for hours, some for days. Attempts to delegate authority collided with the tradition of direct appeal to the Minister. The waste of time was appalling.

In my report to AID on the Caribbean-Central America visits, I made the following suggestions, among others:

1. United States AID policy should stress the practical aspects of education.
2. The staff should begin where the people were.

3. Close relations with the Ministry of Education should be continued, plus tactful efforts to get past the bureaucracy to the people.
4. A summary of achievements should be compiled and widely circulated at least annually.
5. Combined and organized efforts should be made by all U.S. AID missions for the development of teaching materials in the local language.
6. Each mission should establish and maintain a list of persons who had been assisted in any way by AID.
7. The Minister of Education should be encouraged to delegate authority to regional officials.
8. Although the AID staff was in general capable and devoted, almost all agreed that their briefing sessions before reporting overseas were not only inadequate but also in serious respects inaccurate. It would be better to give no information than to misinform.

AID in Asia

In the series of visits to AID missions in Asia, the same general conclusions emerged.

The Washington briefings for those assigned to Asia were even worse than for personnel assigned to Central America. One major reason for this shortcoming, apart from inevitable human errors and misunderstandings, was the lag in recruitment, appointment, and assignment. Key posts were left vacant for months. The departing technicians should have been able to pass on to their successors the results of their own experience and knowledge of plans, personalities, and needs. Such conversations rarely occurred. There was a gap where there should have been overlap.

In Asia, as elsewhere, there existed two modes of education aid. One form was that of an agreement or contract between an American university and a university in the host country. Under such a contract the American university agreed to supply a training and/or research program of a specified kind and duration. The costs were paid by the U.S. AID program. The other method of operation was more direct: short-term or long-term employees of the United States Government were sent to other countries to advise and assist in the improvement of education.

While there were exceptions to the rule, it seemed clear to me that the university contracts were rendering by far the better service. Their goals were clearer, step-by-step planning was more feasible, and much better continuity was possible so as to minimize the gap-not-lap phenomenon that plagued much of the AID effort.

As I pointed out in my reports, however, the university contract approach had one serious shortcoming. It seemed unlikely that economic and political stability could develop solely on the basis of a few highly educated engineers and technicians. Illiteracy in these countries persisted and even in some areas expanded. Almost everyone agreed that the general population needed basic education in order to take part in the government of their own country and in its economic development. Yet the people who were receiving the least help from us were the teachers in the primary and secondary schools who served most of the people. I offered some practical suggestions for dealing with this dilemma.

My report came down strongly against the needless entanglements and irritations suffered by Americans abroad as a result of the indifference of their own government. For example, the situation regarding schooling for children of overseas Americans was then in many places completely chaotic, a hazard to recruitment, and thus a danger to the entire program.

The United States Government was spending millions of dollars to assist the nationals of other countries. It should generously support, without quibbling, the Americans who received these very difficult and often hazardous overseas assignments. I felt that the situation called for more than a series of minor adjustments in existing regulations. A fresh policy was needed deliberately designed to make life as safe and convenient as possible for Americans carrying important and difficult overseas responsibilities.

Several high points in the course of our investigations should be noted. In *Korea* I was impressed by the rapid improvement in the school buildings as contrasted with the widespread ruin and desolation seen only three years earlier.

In *Taiwan* we were impressed by the developing rural school curriculum closely related to the needs of the community and its people. The remarkable rate of growth in GNP in the Republic of China during the past 15 years or so is, in considerable part, due to improved education.

In *Ceylon* we were depressed by the continuing strife and uncoordination among the English-speaking, Tamil-speaking, and Singalese-speaking teachers.

In *India* we were dismayed by the miniscule staff of the U.S. AID mission for a country so vast and varied. It seemed to me a classic illustration of the waste of effort by providing only enough help to raise great expectations and to insure bitter disappointment. Such a feeble understaffed program as we saw might in its long-range effects be worse than none at all.

Along the way

The preceding pages, I ruefully realize, give a very businesslike view of our visits abroad. I would not like to leave the impression that in these working travels we did not see many charming and interesting people and regions. We saw and enjoyed in 1956, for example, such varied things as the immense engineering triumph of the Panama Canal dividing continents and uniting oceans; the jewel-like opera house in San Jose, Costa Rica ("We simply can't have revolutions in Costa Rica," said our friend, "because our Opera House might be damaged and it cost us too much to permit any such risk."); the strange flower-bedecked combination of the rites of the Catholic Church in Chichicastenango with the pagan heritage of its Indian parishioners; the flaming eruptions of Izalco (the lighthouse) volcano in El Salvador, beginning with a series of prolonged earth-shaking snarls, followed by the white-hot explosion of lava against the night sky, the huge sparks soaring upwards, the rising roar of rolling rocks as the hardening lava cascaded down the sides of the volcanic cone, the last heaving sigh of the earth, and the forty minute wait in the night until the next upheaval; the mysterious ruins of the Mayan Empire in Chichen Itza, monuments of a culture which had flowered and fallen five centuries before Columbus and which at its peak was superior or equal to the best of Europe in astronomy, architecture, and medicine; the *tinikling* dancers of Baguio; the Emerald Buddha in Bangkok, seated in a temple of such riotous construction that, one imagined, its architect must have been a slightly inebriated and continuously hallucinating genius; the Perahera in Kandy, Ceylon, the annual religious festival in which a tooth of Buddha, encased in a priceless vase, is slowly and ceremoniously carried in procession by a drove of bejewelled elephants, all reverently escorted by hundreds of torch-bearing, whip-cracking, wildly-costumed Kandy dancers; the

Taj Mahal, which neither requires nor permits description; the public open-air laundries in Bombay; the palace of the Maharajah in Jaipur; the airfield at Lahore where camels grazed between the landing strips and the customs inspector operated in a very large brown tent with a bureaucratic intensity exactly like his opposite numbers in India.

10 WCOTP: 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962

Frankfort–End of the Comité d'Entente - Bavarian teachers' centennial - Wurzburg; Rome–First meeting with FISE representatives - Visits in Yugoslavia; Washington–Friendship Night and other special features - Exodus of East German teachers - Latin-American seminar; Amsterdam–Second meeting with FISE - The Cuban delegation vanishes - Conakry meeting; New Delhi–Message from President Kennedy - Prime Minister Nehru - Debate on relations with FISE; Stockholm–"Something there is that doesn't love a Wall" - Terror in Vietnam - President Eisenhower

FRANKFORT, 1957

After the annual meetings in such exotic (to us) places as Istanbul and Manila, our Assembly in Frankfort, Federal Republic of Germany, might have appeared to be a letdown for some of the delegates. In fact, however, the Frankfort meeting included many unusual events.

A dramatic moment occurred when delegates from the Israel Teachers Union arrived. This was the first appearance of Israeli teachers on German soil. It is likely that this was the first time that any Israeli professional attended an international meeting in Germany. In the Frankfort delegation were persons whose families had been destroyed by the Nazi malevolence. The Israeli spokesman said that his delegation felt "a deep psychological need" to make a statement. He spoke of "deep tragic experiences" which showed that "humanity needs teachers who strive for freedom and justice." Such principles, he said, animated WCOTP and were the only principles that offered hope for the future of humankind. Representatives of the German teachers, deeply moved as were all the delegates, expressed their satisfaction that the Israeli teachers were present.

Following this exchange, a meeting was arranged between members of the delegations from Israel and Germany. This session was conducted in a most amicable spirit, and both groups pledged to work for the ideals of WCOTP in their respective countries and to maintain and develop a harmonious relationship between the teachers of the two countries.

End of the Comité d'Entente

Another series of important events occurred just before the WCOTP meeting began. IFTA voted to leave the Comité d'Entente and to cease all relations with FISE. At the same time IFTA called on WCOTP to take all measures necessary to establish relations with all teachers throughout the world. This was exactly the step that we had hopefully arranged in Manila a year before. It was a close vote: 33 yeas, 29 nays, and 14 abstentions.

FIPESO, on the other hand, voted (31-10) not to withdraw from its FISE relationships. However, FIPESO was a relatively small organization and the departure of IFTA from the Comité d'Entente bereft the Committee of most of its influence. It shortly passed into nothingness.

It was clear at Frankfort that most of the WCOTP members wanted the Confederation to move quickly to seek relations with FISE as well as with other international groups of teachers. Accordingly the Executive Committee decided to write a letter at once inviting discussion of cooperation with other international organizations of teachers. The draft letter was approved by a large majority of the Assembly of Delegates. It was sent to FISE, the International Association of University Professors and Lecturers, the World Union of Catholic Teachers, and the International Federation of Free Teachers Unions. Five members of the Executive Committee were named to conduct any further negotiations that might be needed.

The Frankfort meeting was honored by a special message from President Heuss of Germany and by the participation of Dr. Luther Evans, Director-General of UNESCO.

The Frankfort Assembly voted to admit to national membership teachers' organizations of Burma, Cuba, Hong Kong, Iran, Ireland, Pakistan, and Panama. At the same time the teachers' organizations of Austria and Mauritius were cancelled from membership for nonpayment of dues and lack of response to inquiries.

Even so, the 1957 meeting was the largest thus far in WCOTP history–200 delegates from 66 national members.

Preparations for the meeting were completed in January 1957 in my conversations at Frankfort with the officials of the German Teachers Association. My old friend, Dr. James Conant, was then the United States Ambassador to Bonn. He invited me to visit him there and placed me further in his debt by arranging a dinner for me at the Embassy to meet and talk about WCOTP with about a dozen of Germany's educational leaders.

Bavarian teacher's centennial–Wurzburg

I also had the pleasure, just before the Frankfort Assembly, of attending the centennial meeting of the Bavarian Teachers Association in Wurzburg. This visit was arranged for me by Wilhelm Ebert who had learned about teachers' organizations from an exchange program involving officials of the Pennsylvania State Education Association. The Wurzburg meeting was a delight, partly because I could observe at first hand how skillfully Herr Ebert had adapted some American procedures to his effective use in Bavaria, partly because I learned a good deal from his success, and partly because the meeting was held in the Residenz. It is, I believe, the most elegant room in which I ever appeared. The murals and the ceiling were painted in the early 18th Century by Giovanni Tiepolo of Venice.

ROME, 1958

Between the Frankfort (1957) and the Rome (1958) meetings of the Delegate Assembly the work of WCOTP went steadily forward. I was able to secure added funds from UNESCO and foundation sources. The income from membership dues slowly increased by the acquisition of new members and the growth of members already affiliated. A quarterly magazine, *Panorama*, and an occasional newsletter, *Echo*, were published. We were beginning to form specialized committees in rural education, education for handicapped children, educational journalism, and technical and vocational education. An Assistant Secretary-General was appointed. Regional Conferences were arranged to support two of the three UNESCO major projects.

First meeting with FISE representatives

The Liaison Committee created by the Delegate Assembly at Frankfort was active throughout the year, and it succeeded in securing useful understandings between WCOTP and several other international teachers' organizations.

The meeting between representatives of FISE and of WCOTP took place at Geneva in mid-July, 1958, just before the WCOTP meeting in Rome. The meeting had been planned to occupy two full days, but the arrival of one of the FISE representatives was delayed. All six members of the WCOTP delegation had arrived the evening before, as had all the other members of the FISE group. Our proposal that we meet at the agreed hour was instantly disapproved by each and every one in the FISE delegation. We next proposed that we begin the meeting informally, make no decisions of substance, and summarize our discussions for the missing delegate when he arrived.

That proposal, too, was declined. Thus we had to while away the morning hours in small talk, buying each other cups of coffee and taking short walks along the banks of the Rhone. Meanwhile, the professional interpreter and the bilingual stenographer whose services I had retained were adding up their bills as the hours passed. The belated delegate was the head of the All-Soviet Union of Educational Workers. None of the others would risk a word without him.

This was not an auspicious opening but when he did arrive, the Soviet spokesman took charge of the FISE delegates and we emerged with an acceptable plan of cooperation.

It provided for meetings in Geneva at least once a year between representatives of the two organizations. Decisions must be unanimous. Publications and delegations would be exchanged. The first meeting would compare the common points of the WCOTP and FISE programs. Records of the meetings must be approved by both organizations. Administrative expenses would be shared equally. The chair would alternate. Preparation for the meetings and the custody of records would be arranged jointly by the two secretaries-general. Finally this memorandum of agreement would become operative when ratified by the two organizations.

A few weeks later, in Rome, the Agreement was quickly approved by the WCOTP Executive and recommended by it to the Delegate Assembly. And then the lid blew off.

The French delegates wanted more time to study the Agreement (it contained about 500 words). A Belgian delegate said bluntly that he wanted nothing at all to do with Communist teachers' organizations. He recalled recent events in Budapest. An Irish delegate, less bluntly, took the same position.

Many of the delegates who now were in opposition had themselves taken part in the Comite d'Entente which involved far more close relations with the Communist teachers than the Agreement we put before them. It was difficult to understand why at Istanbul, Manila, and Frankfort the Executive had been prodded to move forward in relationships with FISE and yet was now being told to slow down.

The Agreement was at last approved with numerous abstentions.

The theme of the Rome meeting was "Public Support for Education." The topic was ably discussed in the Presidential Address, in four discussion groups, and in the resolutions. In this respect, at least, the Assembly was united. Everyone believed that Public Support for Education was a very good idea.

At Rome several new national members were admitted, including five national teachers' organizations from Africa alone.

Visits in Yugoslavia

After the Rome meeting, at the invitation of the Yugoslav teachers, my wife and I visited their country from the Julian Alps to the major central cities and on to the Adriatic coastal towns and islands. I must say that the Yugoslav teachers have always, since they joined in 1952, been almost ideal members of WCOTP. They rarely fail to send delegates to major meetings no matter how remote, they pay their dues, they speak their minds briefly, and they refrain from attempting to use WCOTP as a platform for partisan debate or international name-calling. Until Zambia came along, much later, Yugoslavia was last alphabetically in our list of national members, but it was in the forefront in terms of intelligent professional cooperation.

WASHINGTON, 1959

The meeting in Washington, D.C. was held in the Crabtree Auditorium of the National Education Association. It was a tight fit, partly because of the large number of United States teachers who wanted to see and hear a session of the organization in which they had invested so much time, money, and goodwill. WCOTP had a chartered plane, Paris-Washington-Paris, and sold tickets very cheaply.

Friendship Night and other special features

Several new devices were invented for this occasion. One of these was the highly successful "Friendship Night." Residents of the Washington area, including numerous volunteers from the NEA staff, invited one delegate to spend an evening with them. Hosts were so selected and assigned that any delegate who did not speak English was the guest of a person who did know his or her language. With a few last-minute exceptions, each host had only one guest. The host could provide any program he or she wished, but there was one requirement: each host took the guest home for at least a short time, even though, as in some cases, the meal was taken at a restaurant. Hosts could, if they wished, invite other persons to join the party and to meet their guest. Credit for the invention of the idea of Friendship Night should go to my wife. We settled the general outline of the plan shortly after the WCOTP Assembly in Rome, a meeting marked by very limited contact between the delegates and the Italian people.

Once started, Friendship Night has continued to be observed in many WCOTP meetings. I believe that its success lies in far-ahead planning and close personalized follow-up.

Another innovation at the Washington Assembly was the preparation of a 20-minute sound film of the Assembly, from the arrival of delegates to the adoption of resolutions. By careful planning and fast development this film was shown as the final feature at the farewell banquet. The delegates were kept unaware of this film's existence until it was actually projected. A few delegates who asked about the portable camera were told that the crew was taking shots for possible use in a TV documentary. The surprised delegates were delighted to see themselves and their friends in various conference activities and even more pleased when each delegation was given a print of the film to help them share the experience with their colleagues at home.

The program theme was a direct contribution to one of the three major topics for UNESCO at that time: "Mutual Appreciation of Eastern and Western Cultural Values." It was discussed in the Presidential Address, in the General Assembly, and in four special groups dealing with the preparation of teachers, curriculum and teaching materials and methods, the promotion of family and community support, and action by international bodies.

Exodus of East German teachers

Just before the Washington Assembly a great exodus of teachers and other trained workers from East Germany began. WCOTP received a report of a Special Committee on Refugee Teachers from East Germany. It showed a fifty percent increase in the number of such teachers between 1957 and 1958. A third of all these refugee teachers had been trained in the Soviet-occupied zone. The treatment to which these teachers were subjected was, the Special Report declared, in violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The chief French delegate warmly supported this report and urged that it be widely circulated.

For students, a prominent factor motivating the Westward movement was the lack of opportunity for further education because of various discriminatory regulations in East Germany; for example, the occupation or former occupation of their parents, or the political orthodoxy of parents or of students. The teachers who moved to the West named, as their principal motivation, requirements that they present false or misleading materials to their students, spy and report on pupils and parents, attend numerous political rallies, stress the activities of the Young Pioneers and other Communist youth programs at the expense of activities sponsored by the church and approved by the home, and the performance on occasion of military or semi-military service.

Latin American seminar

In arranging the Washington Assembly, I thought I saw an opportunity to involve more of the Latin-American teachers' associations. Accordingly I set up several special meetings for the Latin American delegates. I thought that to see at first hand the purposes and programs of WCOTP might increase their interest and their subsequent national membership. A representative of FISE, claiming to be a delegate from Chile, managed to get into these Latin American meetings. Playing upon their fear of the Colossus of the North, this FISE spokeswoman made enough trouble to endanger the success of the whole effort. We therefore arranged a meeting between the WCOTP Executive and the Latin Americans at the Assembly. This meeting was a dreary business at the end of a long day of work. However, by patience and much discussion, it was agreed that WCOTP had the right to seek new members in Latin America just as any Latin American teachers' organization had a right to reject such an invitation, that as WCOTP developed further contacts in Latin America it would apply in general to existing representative national organizations. Since we in WCOTP had never had any other thoughts than these, we gladly approved the recommendations.

However, the weakness of Latin American teachers' organizations (there are a few important exceptions) has continued to be a major recruitment problem for WCOTP.

AMSTERDAM, 1960

During the Amsterdam meeting the WCOTP Liaison Committee gave a report to the Assembly to bring up to date the account of the efforts of WCOTP to develop cooperation with the Communist teachers in FISE. In April 1959 the Liaison Committee was preparing to go to Geneva to engage in a full exchange of information about the programs of the two organizations. It had been explicity agreed in 1958 that such an exchange would be the subject of the 1959 meeting. We submitted to FISE, long in advance of the 1959 meeting, a list of topics on which we believed an exchange of information would be helpful.

Second meeting with FISE

Since we had encountered great difficulty in securing agreement on the record of the 1958 meeting, we proposed to avoid these difficulties in the future by agreement in advance that the record of an experienced impartial professional stenographer would become the accepted record of the meeting. This proposal was rejected by FISE and by the time of the 1959 WCOTP Assembly the problem of keeping an accurate record of the meetings was still unsolved. The 1959 Assembly voted that the Liaison Committee should continue to try to carry out the spirit of the 1958 meeting. On the same day as this decision by the WCOTP Assembly (August 5, 1959), I wrote to FISE informing it about our Assembly's decision and pointing out in some detail the differences between us in the text of the Agreement. Seven weeks elapsed before we heard from FISE proposing that the 1960 meeting of the two sets of delegates be devoted to a reconciliation of the variant versions of the Agreement. I consulted the WCOTP Executive and it was thereupon decided that a second meeting merely to agree on the text of the first meeting was an unjustifiable expense. On January 6, I informed FISE of this decision and made one more effort to propose alternative versions of the record which would still satisfy our insistence on a truthful report of the 1968 Agreement. I had no reply. Six weeks later I sent FISE an urgent letter stating that if a 1960 meeting were to be held plans for it must be made very soon. FISE replied that our January letter was still being studied and promised a reply in two weeks. Four weeks later the promised reply arrived. FISE had not budged a millimeter. They offered only their own long-hand record of the Agreement, take it or leave it.

It seemed clear to me, and it was slowly becoming clear to many of my colleagues that (1) FISE was in all essential respects the voice of the Soviet Educational Workers Union, (2) that the voice of this Union was in fact the voice of the Soviet Government, and (3) that the chief concern of FISE was to wage a propaganda war against the United States, and thus to win for the Soviet Union power in the developing countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. I am sorry to have come to this conclusion, but it is the only one my reason will accept.

One example: In the process of exchanging information between WCOTP and FISE, we spoke informally about the magazines each organization produced and circulated,–*Panorama* (WCOTP), and *Teachers of the World* (FISE). From there we went naturally into a discussion of the high printing and translating costs for these magazines. I reported that *Panorama* was published in English, French, and Spanish and, with the cooperation of some of our members elsewhere, in Arabic, Japanese, Tamil, Malay, Greek, Korean, and Portuguese. Then we asked the FISE representatives about the languages used by *Teachers of the World.* The answer was, I believe, English, French, Japanese, Spanish and (perhaps) German. "But," exclaimed one of the WCOTP representatives, "you surely publish editions in Russian and Chinese?" This was before the days of the Sino-Soviet split, when the Chinese teachers' union was an active member of FISE. It turned out that neither Russian nor Chinese members of FISE could read their own magazine. The FISE delegates were obliged to agree that the FISE magazine was a means of sharing information and ideas from which both Soviet and Chinese teachers were excluded although they surely accounted for at least three-fourths of the FISE membership.

The Cuban delegation vanishes

I had a mysterious cable and letter correspondence with the Cuba Teachers Syndicate a week or so before I left Washington for Amsterdam. The Cuban teachers' *colegios* had been carried on our general mailing list ever since I visited Havana in 1955. Five of them became associate members.

A cable from Havana announced that the Cuban teachers would send about a dozen delegates to Amsterdam and requested me to reserve hotel rooms for them beginning approximately one week before the WCOTP meeting. My block reservation agreement with our hotel in Amsterdam, the Krasnopolsky, did not become effective until the day before our Assembly would begin. For all I knew, Amsterdam might be the host of another large conference immediately before our arrival. Nevertheless, I sent a friendly cable back to Havana, said I could and would guarantee the availability of rooms. I followed this cable with a letter explaining that I could be sure to put the Cubans in the Krasnopolsky during the WCOTP Assembly but that they might be placed in another hotel for the preceding week. I also requested a list of names and the hour and day of their arrival at Schipol airport in order that the Dutch hospitality committee could meet them. The rest is silence. No Cuban appeared; there was no further correspondence, then or since.

In retrospect, I can make an educated guess at what happened. The syndicate was reorganized with the arrival of the Castro regime and the government probably told the teachers to affiliate with teachers elsewhere in the world. Unsophisticated, the Cuban teachers sent me this telegram. Later, they no doubt learned that their cable to me was a mistake on their part, that loyal teachers were supposed to go to the Communist rally which was held that summer in Conakry, Guinea.

Conakry meeting

The Conakry rally, by the way, was not highly successful. The African teachers' organizations, with few exceptions, preferred to meet with WCOTP in Amsterdam. A few Africans who were ordered to attend at Conakry by their own governments went along; a few particularly courageous ones (as in Ghana) found ways to avoid going to Conakry at all. A former teacher who became the first Minister of Education for the newly-established Congo (formerly a Belgian colony) flew right past Conakry and came directly to Amsterdam. The large enthusiastic delegations from Africa which took part in the Amsterdam meeting were a testimonial to the work of WCOTP in that continent,--work performed with great ability and devotion by Raymond Smyke in the WCOTP central office and by Bennett Caulley, a retired secretary of the Ghana National Association of Teachers who was Director of the WCOTP African office on the basis of full-time work, part-time pay.

The theme of the Amsterdam Assembly, "Child Health and the School," was a popular one. The Assembly discussions on health services in schools, on health education, and on healthful school living attracted a good deal of public and professional interest.

NEW DELHI, 1961

We had an unusually small Executive Committee at the New Delhi meeting. The President, Sir Ronald Gould, and one other member were detained in London by the critical state of negotiations regarding teachers' salaries. Another member was critically ill. Our Vice-President, Shri Natarajan, took over the Presidential duties and performed them well.

Message from President Kennedy

The formal part of the Delhi meeting was impressive. The Assembly was addressed by the Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru;

the Minister of Education, K. L. Shrimali; the Minister of Science and Cultural Affairs, Humayun Kabir; and the Minister of Defense, V. K. Krishna Menon. We also had messages from two heads of state: Mrs. Banderanaike, Prime Minister of Ceylon; and John F. Kennedy, President of the United States.

The message of good will and encouragement from President Kennedy was a complete surprise to me, but a very agreeable one. I had not requested a statement from the White House or made any special effort to announce the New Delhi meeting in government circles. In midmorning of the day I left Washington for India the White House telephoned to ask me for the exact full name of the Confederation and the President's letter was delivered to me by hand a half-hour before I left home for the airport. It was read by the Chairperson of the NEA delegation and was received with great acclaim. The immense popularity of President Kennedy was an impressive global phenomenon.

Returning to the high-ranking Indian politicians at the WCOTP Assembly, let me add a word about Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon. As Minister of Defense, his official appearance at a teachers' conference was not at all necessary or even expected. We had heard from the Prime Minister and from the Ministers of Education and Culture. Yet, I was told by the Indian hosts that it was essential that Mr. Menon appear. I postponed the event as long as I could because I feared that his well-known antipathy to the United States and its policies might push the Assembly into a general political debate which is forbidden by the WCOTP Constitution.

On the morning of the last day of the Assembly, Mr. Menon appeared and spoke at considerable length. He had no manuscript, nor even any notes that I could see. He undertook to define "the place of education in this world" and he said he would do so by tracing "the expansion of the dimension of the mind through the years." He said that "dynamism must be introduced into education so that a universal sense of values will become the background of civilization." This sense of values, he said, could be achieved through an education that is "flexible enough to recognize the pluralistic nature of all manifestations." He went on for some time in this polysyllabic vein. He certainly did not approach any controversial political issues –or if he did I was not clever enough to detect it. The truth is that I really had no clear idea what he was saying. I feel sure that many of his listeners from various parts of the world were glad to see and hear and evaluate this man who over so many years wielded great power in the Government of India.

Prime Minister Nehru

In contrast, Prime Minister Nehru spoke quite simply and directly. He told the delegates that they were meeting when grave problems are at issue, and "no man can say what may descend upon us in the next few months." We say that education is the way to solve the world's problems and yet the most highly-educated nations are full of violent hostility towards each other. The type of education we provided had not led to that international cooperation which has become essential to the world's growth and even to the world's survival. "That," he said, "troubles me."

Does some inevitable fate require us to be helpless spectators of this tragic drama, he asked. You are to discuss training for responsibility, an important subject. But still, responsibility for what? Responsibility for our next-door neighbor or for a neighbor who lives in another country? On the threshold of the space age, national boundaries are out-of-date, and yet our minds continue to function in a narrow way. A certain tribalism clings to us all. In India we are trying to get rid of a tribalism called caste.

Education, he continued, is obviously desirable but I do not always find educated people so desirable! Whether they act as individuals or as a group or as a nation, they have, in spite of their education, rather closed minds. Education should open the mind and enable a person to understand other human beings. Even the best education available is still producing a pugnacious type of humanity. "How can we get rid of this rather narrow approach which only leads to conflict –conflict today being an exceedingly dangerous thing?. . . . .Well, it is a problem worthy of your study."

It was easy to see why such a man could be so deeply –one might almost say so reverently, adored by the people of India. I had the responsibility to escort the Prime Minister from his car to the auditorium where our Assembly was in session. He met each member of the Executive Committee along the way with great charm and dignity.

Yet, below the charming, cool and eloquent surface of Mr. Nehru's public behavior, I believe I caught just a glimpse of a tension of unpredictable explosiveness. We were seated on the stage with his immediate entourage and the WCOTP Executive. The row of small tables between us and the audience was equipped with microphones to augment the sound as well as to carry it to the simultaneous interpreters. One of the introductory speakers was speaking from this seated position. I told Mr Nehru softly that he could use the microphone on his table if he wished but that if he preferred to stand while speaking, we had installed a microphone and a line to the interpreters on a podium near the front of the stage. He turned to me, violently angry, eyes blazing. He told me that this was *his* auditorium, that he had it built, that he knew all about it, and that he needed no help or advice from me in the delivery of his speech.

I have thought since then about the possible causes of this outbreak. He would not have already known about the microphones because I had given the instructions to hook in the interpreters' booth only a half-hour before. Did my information interrupt some important chain of thought? I doubt it; it was too brief and direct and could have been answered by merely nodding that I was understood. Was he particularly irritable about the United States that morning? That, I think, is a possibility. But my best explanation is that Mr. Nehru, "on parade," as it were, almost every moment of the day, developed tensions and frustrations which were made bearable only by some outbreak of anger, even though the object of the anger and the immediate cause of it are entirely irrelevant. I imagine that many prominent public persons have the same general problem and make a similar response to it.

Debate on relations with FISE

During all the WCOTP meetings at about this time—and the New Delhi meeting was no exception—many European delegates were insistently asked for more rapid progress in WCOTP cooperation with the Communist teachers. But when we engaged in discussion of actual programs with FISE, our ideas for cooperation were received without enthusiasm or rejected without explanation.

At New Delhi the familiar debate was continued with a new twist. A French delegate observed that WCOTP and FISE seemed to be following the lines of the two great power blocs in the world. He said that WCOTP-FISE cooperation on specific school problems would be a "comforting demonstration" to the world in this critical time. He asked whether the Executive Committee would proceed along the lines he proposed, adding the diaphanous threat that the failure of the Executive in this respect would lead "certain" unnamed organizations to establish relations on their own with the Eastern Europeans.

This might have ended the debate for the moment but I was so weary with the constant nagging directed at the Executive that I did not let the issue fade from sight. I declared that WCOTP was completely separate from anything that could be called a power bloc. I pointed out that WCOTP dealt only with matters authorized by its Constitution. "I am obliged," I said, "to demur to the identification of WCOTP with one of the power blocs that divide the world. FISE may be so identified, but WCOTP is not."

STOCKHOLM, 1962

Three events took the spotlight in the 1962 WCOTP Assembly in Stockholm:

1. The impact of the Berlin Wall on the teachers, schools, and children of that city
2. The renewed ferocity of the Vietcong in attacking schools, children, and teachers supported by the Saigon government
3. The address of President Eisenhower

"Something there is that doesn't love a Wall"

Even before the Berlin Wall was built, the (West) German Teachers Association, as a member of WCOTP, had asked the Confederation for help.

The westward movement included not only teachers at all levels but also physicians, engineers, technicians, and many others. So great was the exodus that in 1954 three refugee centers were established in West Berlin. The number of teachers passing through these centers averaged about 100 per month for seven successive years.

Few, if any, persons predicted the dramatic reaction of the East German Government. On August 13, 1961 a ten foot wall was swiftly constructed all along the westward edge of the East Berlin zone. The East German Government declared at first that the purpose of the Wall was to exclude "spies and saboteurs" but the reason given was so ridiculous that within a few months it became necessary for Walter Ulbricht to admit publicly that the major reason for the Wall was to check the hemorrhage to the West of intellectuals and other highly trained persons.

In November 1961, IFTA held an Executive Committee meeting in the western part of Berlin. Observing the many educational problems created by the new Wall dividing the city, IFTA requested WCOTP to appoint a Commission of Inquiry to study and report on this problem. This was the first request ever made of WCOTP by IFTA, and it was highly desirable that our reaction be prompt and emphatic. Sir Ronald Gould, the President of WCOTP, asked me to be chairperson of the Commission of Inquiry with other members from WCOTP affiliates in Kenya, Malaysia, and France. The Commission of Inquiry assembled in Berlin on December 6.

We held twelve working sessions, visited the refugee center in Marienfeld, two secondary schools, and (of course) the Wall itself. We took evidence from about 100 witnesses, mostly on an individual basis including, however, some students in groups. We also examined about 200 letters from active teachers, retired teachers, and students in East Berlin. At our first meeting we telegraphed the East German Teachers Union inviting their president or his agents to meet with us, at any convenient time and place, to present any information relevant to our inquiry. We received proof of the delivery of this message but no reply.

Each witness before the Commission was told that a record was being made but that witnesses were also free to go "off the record." Except for asking that their names not be disclosed, few witnesses went off the record. There was considerable publicity about our Inquiry in the Berlin press, and we publicly invited anyone with information to come forward.

The total evidence taken amounted to over 300 typewritten pages. The testimony is filled with tragedy, despair, inspired courage, and sacrifice. The temptation to quote some of it here is almost irresistable but I shall refrain, for if I begin I shall find it difficult to stop.

In place of the presentation of individual cases I shall summarize the Commission's most important decisions. We were unanimous on all items.

First, we recognized that the Wall separated teachers from students and children from their families, and that the situation confronting many teachers obliged to remain in East Germany constituted a grave assault on their personal and professional freedoms.

We appealed to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights issued by the United Nations on December 10, 1948, and in particular to two Articles of the Declaration:

> Article 13: "Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country."
>
> Article 26: "Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace."

The Inquiry Commission urged the widest possible distribution of its report and of the information it contained so that the catastropic events it reports "may reach as many understanding minds and compassionate hearts as possible."

We recommended that visits be exchanged between Berlin teachers and teachers from other parts of the world so as to encourage continuous study of the problems aggravated by the construction of the Wall. In this connection, I was later able to arrange for three West Berlin teachers to tour Latin America and West Africa to give a firsthand account to teachers and their organizations, as well as to the general public, in those regions. I met them in Washington before they set forth and talked with them again in Post-of-Spain, Trinidad, as they completed their arduous tour south of our border.

I consider the Berlin Wall to be the most important single visual aid available in teaching the significance of freedom and of oppression.

Terror in Vietnam

While the Commission of Inquiry met in Berlin, the Second WCOTP Asian Leadership Training Seminar was meeting in Saigon with participation by WCOTP member organizations in Brunei, Ceylon, Republic of China, India, Japan, Korea, Malaya, New Zealand, Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam. These representatives adopted the following Resolution:

> "Having heard reports of such deplorable acts as the burning of school buildings and educational materials, the murdering of teachers, the denial of educational opportunities to school children in Viet-Nam we recommend that WCOTP appoint a Commission of Inquiry to undertake an examination to assess the impact of these terrorist activities on education in the Republic of Viet-Nam."

The President at once appointed a Commission of Inquiry chaired by the WCOTP Vice-President, Shri Natarajan of India, with other members from the teachers' organizations of Germany, Congo (Brazzaville), and France. The Commission met in Saigon eight days in May, 1962. It visited schools and homes in two provinces, interviewed victims and their close relatives, and published an open invitation to anyone wishing to present evidence. The Commission found that educational progress, especially in primary schools, had occurred from 1954; that systematic attacks against village schools began in limited areas in 1959, and by 1961 affected the whole of the Republic; that the attacks were mainly upon the school programs which included civic information and honor to the national flag; that teachers were singled out for attack as government employees; that 32 teachers had already been killed, 73 kidnapped and still missing, 189 kidnapped and released, and 100 tortured; that armed gangs attacked and destroyed school buildings and their contents; that 636 schools had to be closed; that all these terrorist activities were conducted by the Viet-Cong. This group was described in June 1962 by the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Viet-Nam, the Polish delegation dissenting, as a group using "armed and unarmed personnel, arms, munitions and other supplies" sent from the North to the South "with the object of supporting, organizing, and carrying out hostile activities including armed attacks."

The Report contained an appendix giving the names, addresses, and next of kin of the murdered teachers and the names of the destroyed school buildings, together with the dates of the tragedies.

The brief printed report of the Commission of Inquiry for Vietnam was almost ignored by the United States press. I made all the usual approaches to the media (and some unusual ones) but the story, if it appeared at all, was usually short and printed on page

198

20 or thereabouts. It was an omission that puzzled me at the time—and still does.

At the Stockholm Assembly of Delegates reports of the special Commissions of Inquiry in Berlin and Vietnam were adopted by large majorities.

On the Berlin Wall issue, the Japanese Teachers Union spokesman said, somewhat apologetically I thought, that while his delegation did not disbelieve the contents of our report, the Wall had a bearing on the political and economic life of Germany and he would be obliged to abstain from voting. The Yugoslav delegate said succinctly that the Berlin situation should be decided without outside interference. He could not vote for the Report. One delegate from Malaya said that WCOTP should not be excluded from issues of this kind because the concept of human brotherhood was offended by the building of such walls, while another delegate from the same country said that we shouldn't bother ourselves so much about walls in some far-off country. The reference to "far-off" caused some raised eyebrows among the German delegates. However, such a reference was, and perhaps will long continue to be, a reflection of a habit of thinking which rests on assumptions made obsolete by modern developments in communication and transport.

I was particularly impressed by the wisdom and wit of the African delegates on this matter. A delegate from Ghana vigorously denied the Yugoslav remarks about outside interference. The moral rights of teachers and children in Berlin and Vietnam were not entirely internal affairs immune to comment from others. The spokesperson for Kenya said pupils should be free to attend any school they wanted to attend. Instead of building the Wall, the East Berliners would have done better to build schools and "if they have enough schools in Berlin they could build some schools in Africa!"

The Vietnam terrorism report produced a shorter discussion, the principal speakers being two delegates from India who condemned the terrorism as "pernicious, obnoxious, and dangerous."

The Vietnam Report was adopted with two abstentions and two negative votes. The Berlin Report was adopted with four delegations abstaining and two delegations voting in the negative.

President Eisenhower

While he was still in the White House, President Eisenhower established People-to-People —a non-governmental organization which stilll functions. I was a member of its Executive Committee for some years and later a member of its Board of Directors.

During these years I attended meetings of the PTP, with General Eisenhower presiding. At the Kansas City meeting we saw the unusual spectacle of former Presidents Eisenhower and Truman dining amicably together at the PTP Directors' dinner. The next day we made a pilgrimage, as guests of Mr. Truman, to his home and library.

In 1964 I formed part of a PTP goodwill mission to Mexico. We flew there in Air Force One stopping at Guadalajara and Mexico City. The heads of our mission were Major John Eisenhower and Walt Disney.

In 1962, Mr. Joyce Hall, President of PTP and of Hallmark Greeting Cards, invited my wife and me to stay for two days in his guest apartment in Kansas City, Missouri. I remain very glad that we did so, for the visit led us to a deep and lasting friendship. One of its many good outcomes was Mr. Hall's suggestion that he try to arrange for President Eisenhower to go to Stockholm to address the WCOTP Assembly as a representative of People-to-People. I agreed at once and, with characteristic energy and enthusiasm, Mr. Hall did the rest.

Once I had reached Stockholm, I began to hear that General Eisenhower might receive a chilly reception from substantial segments of the Swedish population. I never had time or inclination to find out exactly what General Eisenhower had said or done to offend them.

When the train including the special cars used by the Eisenhower party pulled into the Stockholm station, I was standing beside the United States Ambassador to Sweden and various high municipal and national officials. The General emerged, shook hands genially all 'round, and then, still on the train platform, he turned to the United States Ambassador and said, "Could we have a press conference?"

"Yes sir," said the Ambassador, "we have arranged one for you at the Embassy this afternoon."

"I would like," said Mr. Eisenhower calmly, "to have a press conference right away. Is there a room for it here in the station?"

The stationmaster and other officials were consulted; yes, the station contained a small V.I.P. room that would serve for a press conference.

"Good," said the General, "let's go."

So the television cameras and microphones hurriedly edged into position and then the former President of the United States stood up straight before the lights and said something to this effect: "Some years ago I wrote something uncomplimentary about the Swedish people. I have since learned that the information I relied on at that time was biased and incorrect. I am very glad to say this in the capital city of Sweden and glad to be here where I can get a more correct picture of Swedish life at first hand."

I had always liked and admired General Eisenhower, even when he took positions with which I did not agree and even when he mangled English syntax as he did so. But it seemed to me that he grew several inches taller as he made this brief statement, smiled that irresistable smile, and ended that short special meeting with the press within a few minutes after his arrival. As for the Swedes, they succumbed without a murmur and he received enthusiastic plaudits from Swedish crowds throughout his stay.

In his prepared speech to the WCOTP Assembly, President Eisenhower said all the right things. He said that the teacher is "possibly the most important individual in the entire world." He came out eloquently and unequivocally in favor of the freedom of the teacher to teach the truth. He told what happens when this freedom is denied, using the schools of Hitler and Mussolini as examples. He said that his experience in war, followed by two years as President of Columbia University, had caused him to decide that, whatever else he might be called upon to do, he would forever hold to the purpose of supporting any teacher who was dedicated to truth and to the promotion of mutual understanding between individuals and nations. He concluded by suggesting that educators develop with representatives of the United Nations plans for an international university with a faculty of leading educators selected by the United Nations General Assembly from lists nominated by such teachers' organizations as WCOTP.

The WCOTP Executive moved at once to implement this suggestion. Although progress has been slow the basic idea, with the support of WCOTP and other groups, has moved forward through the jungles of United Nations bureaucracy toward a visible and tangible institution.

President Eisenhower stayed with us long enough to meet every delegate personally. Just before he left Stockholm he spoke briefly by satellite broadcast from Stockholm to the United States. I believe this was the first use of satellite communication of this kind across the Atlantic.

11 WCOTP: 1963, 1964, 1965

Rio de Janeiro, 1963–The Arabs unfold their tent - Conversations on Arab participation - Latin America - Peru - Brazil - Mexico, 1946-59 - Mexico, 1960-63 - Academic, economic, professional, and social; Paris, 1964–Day-by-day - Paris potpourri - Continued work on the status of teachers - One last try for liaison - East Berlin–UNESCO revisited; Addis Ababa, 1965–Haile Selassie - Equal opportunity in education - Arab teachers in Alexandria - Santo Domingo - The barbed wire - International Cooperation Year

RIO DE JANEIRO, 1963

Between the 1962 and 1963 meetings of the WCOTP Assembly I undertook to seek more actively the participation of three groups of teachers' organizations:

1. The Teachers Syndicates in the Arab Countries
2. The teachers organizations in South America
3. The Syndicate of Workers in Education of Mexico

The Arabs unfold their tent

The Royal Egyptian Teachers Association had an able delegate at Endicott in 1946. Since then a tenuous relationship had been maintained. I visited Egypt as part of a UNESCO project in September 1951, but the political instability of the country was too great for more than casual contacts. For example, when I went shopping in Cairo's souk, my Egyptian friends saw to it that I never went there (or anywhere beyond the front verandah of the old Shepherd's Hotel) alone. They escorted me everywhere, one on each side, and never told me why. But I could guess why when I contrasted the terrible poverty of the peasants with the luxury of the handful of upper-class Egyptians in the hotel bar with their evening dress from Bond Street and their Paris gowns and their long, long limousines. A few days after I left Cairo, Shepherd's Hotel was sacked and burned. Within a short time the monarchy was abolished, the King was in exile, and the Royal Egyptian Teachers Association became the Teachers Syndicate of the United Arab Republic.

In 1955 I was briefly in Lebanon, Egypt, Syria, and Jordan, but in the time available I was unable to find or contact any teachers' organization.

In 1958 a group of delegates from Arab teachers' organizations stopped by, as it were, to call on the WCOTP Delegate Assembly in Rome. They were on their way back from a roaring good visit in Moscow where they had been treated with great affection. They were not with us very long and not greatly interested while they stayed, but we did get enough names and addresses to start correspondence.

By 1962 we had a few Arab observers in Stockholm and a part-time branch representative in Beirut to keep the Washington office informed and to translate, publish, and distribute some of the WCOTP publications in Arab countries.

In April 1963 our first major breakthrough occurred: the Secretary-General of WCOTP was invited to attend the annual meeting of the Egyptian Teachers Syndicate. The arrangements had been nudged along partly by Ahmed Khaki, who was Director of Public Education in the city of Alexandria and who had attended the WOTP London Conference as an observer in 1958, and especially by El Said Ali Mohammed, who had been Cultural Attache at the Egyptian Embassy in Washington and who was now the unpaid publicity director for the Teachers Syndicate and a member of its Executive Committee. I was accompanied to Cairo by Wilhelm Ebert, at that time the part-time Director of the WCOTP office in Paris.

After arriving in Cairo we spent the rest of the evening finishing the speech I was to make before the delegates the next morning. Said Ali Mohammed made available to the delegates and the press a text in Arabic.

The candidates for the Executive Committee of the Syndicate are self-nominated by simply signing an application. The election itself appeared to be conducted well. The ballot boxes were locked. Delegates' names were crossed off the list when they had voted. No one but the tellers was allowed in the counting process, which took about five hours for 2,000 ballots. Delegates who failed to vote were known because of the check-off and were criticized.

There was no ballot paper. Each delegate wrote out the full names of nine preferred candidates. There were thirty-nine nominees. This process, of course, made the voting extremely slow; in fact, the election was the only business transacted on the second day.

Both the Assembly and the election were held in a tent, supported by poles lashed together with ropes, the roof consisting of canvas and the walls of carpets. The "floor," which was a dusty football field in its more normal condition, was also covered by carpets.

Most of the delegates wore western dress but about twenty percent of the men wore the floor-length tunic and a turban. The delegates represented about 130,000 teachers in Egypt. Much time was spent deploring the absence of 265 of the 2,000 delegates. About 150 of the delegates were women. None was veiled. All women were seated together. The President of the Syndicate was also one of the five vice-presidents of the Republic. He did not attend the meeting.

The Vice-President of the Syndicate was the Minister of Education. He presided over the meeting *pro forma,* but the actual direction was done by the Secretary-General.

The Minister opened the meeting. He had a full house (or tent). Some passages from the Koran were chanted while the crowd listened reverently. The Minister next greeted everyone, not forgetting those far-away members of the Syndicate who represent UAR as teachers in the schools of other Arab countries.

He greeted the Iraqi Minister of Education, who was also President of the Iraq Teachers Syndicate (wild enthusiasm from the audience; cheerleaders began chanting "Long Live the Arab World"). The same demonstration occurred when the Syrian, Lebanese, and Palestine delegates were introduced. The Secretary-General noted with regret that no delegations were present from

Algeria and Tunis but he said that "nevertheless their hearts are united with ours." (Cheers.)

The Minister of Education of Iraq, in substance, said: When I stood here a year ago, Kassim was oppressing our people. My presence here was against his wishes. Now that is all like a bad dream. We can go home from Cairo, the capital of the Arab world, without fear, thanking God for deliverance, and for the victorious leadership of Gamel Abdel Nasser (furious applause; delegates stood on chairs; one delegate shouted: "One Arab nation; one flag; one syndicate." This was taken up by others, especially in the front of the room.).

He continued that the UAR will take its place in the struggles for peace and for Arab unity. Teachers must build unity. Hail to the revolutions of Egypt, of Algeria, of Yemen, of Syria! (A shout from the floor: "We are ready now for Trans-Jordan"–some applause followed.) We in Iraq have much to do to repair the damage done by the King and by Kassim. We look forward next to the liberation of Palestine.

Dr. Farouk of Lebanon recited a poem about the unity of the Arab world. Shouts arose from the audience urging him to say it again. He did so. My country, he said, is wherever Arabic is spoken from the Atlantic to the Persian Gulf, where culture is valued and all religions are respected. In Lebanon, we respect both the Koran and the Bible.

The Palestine delegate spoke next. He praised President Nasser. The crowd responded, but it was growing tired.

I was the anchorperson among the guests of honor, the only non-Arabic speaker in the tent. My remarks were translated paragraph by paragraph. Every statement I made was applauded twice–once after the English original, once after the translation.

The next speaker came up from the audience. He appeared to be charged with the responsibility of giving thanks for the speeches so far delivered. He said, among many other things, that teachers must oppose imperialism because they revere the great prophets. Teachers are a holy army, with a pen and not with a sword, working always for peace as directed by the Holy Books. He then shifted the subject (rather abruptly, I thought) to the need for more promotions in the salaries of teachers, adding that we could safely leave this to the efforts of our beloved Minister of Education. (Protest from the rear and applause from the front rows.)

The Minister of Education took the floor to explain how he had fought for the education budget, how President Nasser had helped him, how the cigarette tax was increased to raise £.E. 800,000 (about $1,800,000) more for schools. There was applause.

The Secretary-General then announced a half-hour recess for lunch. The meeting resumed two hours later.

Then followed the "safety-valve" part of the program. Any delegate could talk about anything. As far as I could tell, there was substantial freedom of expression. The way in which this talk gets translated into action, remains one of the mysteries of the Nile.

Conversations on Arab participation

The chief delegates of the Arab Teachers Federations held a special meeting so that I might present information about WCOTP and answer their questions. *Present:* Egypt, Lebanon, Iraq, and Palestine. (Syria was away on an excursion.) The meeting lasted three hours.

There was a good deal of informal talk by the Arabs about another year of delay before their membership in WCOTP. I decided, however, to urge a decision before the 1963 meeting. I tried to make it clear that WCOTP recognized a real difference in the rights of members and non-members.

The questioning was friendly and profuse.

I concluded that a decision to affiliate would not be taken without approval in high political circles. The Arab teachers wanted to affiliate and the meeting supplied them with facts to help them to persuade others that affiliation would be to their advantage.

A meeting was arranged for me with the U.A.R. Vice-President because the Arab teachers wanted me to meet him. The Vice-President spoke English quite well.

My Arab friends had advised me to prepare a little speech to the Vice-President which, they said, should include the following four points:

a. WCOTP covered the world, stressing India, Ghana, newly-liberated countries of Africa and Asia
b. WCOTP welcomed Arab delegations as guests in Stockholm; Arabic was spoken in an international teachers' meeting for the first time
c. I was glad to return that visit and to observe the many changes in this nation since I had first come here in 1951

d. I was greatly honored to be received by the Vice-President here

The Vice-President then thanked me for coming and shifted to Arabic, asking questions around the room. I was told later that these questions dealt with WCOTP: Just as the Vice-President seemed to be satisfied with the information received, the Minister of Education, who was seated at his right, said "You know there are two international teachers' organizations." Ebert immediately said, "Mr. Vice-President, I don't understand Arabic but did someone say that there are two international teacher organizations?"

This was confirmed, and Ebert said, "I must beg to differ; there are not two international teachers' organizations. There is an international communist organization which uses teachers for its political purposes and there is WCOTP—a world-wide professional organization that works to improve schools and teachers."

This was a timely intervention. The Vice-President, who had apparently been ready to turn thumbs down on the affiliation said, "Well, we had better look at this question again."

They were still looking at it when I left Cairo the next day. They were still looking at it three months later, at the WCOTP Assembly in Rio. Spokespersons for the Teachers Syndicates of Egypt, Iraq, and Lebanon, as well as for the Federation of Arab Teachers (F.A.T.S.) were present at the Rio Assembly. They each made friendly speeches and implied that their respective organizations would vote to affiliate with WCOTP within the coming year. The Syndicates of Lebanon and the United Arab Republic did so and were formally admitted to WCOTP membership in 1964. Teachers' organizations of Sudan and Tunisia were added to the Arab members' list in 1965, of Morocco in 1966, and of Iraq in 1967.

When war came again to the Middle East in 1967, and Israel occupied some Arab territory in Jerusalem, Syria, and the Sinai, one result was immediate pressure from both the Israeli and the Arab member organizations to line up the World Confederation on one side or the other. The result of WCOTP neutrality on this issue was the erosion of our good relations with the Arab teachers which we had so slowly and painfully developed. By 1972 nearly all of the former Arab member organizations of WCOTP had stolen away—but not, alas, silently. The large and powerful Arab syndicates were welcomed into the Communist-sponsored FISE. Almost all of our efforts to involve Arab teachers and their organizations lay in ruins. All that remained at the time was a network of personal friendships and shared memories.

Latin America

In preparation for the Rio de Janeiro meeting, all of us at WCOTP, especially José Rivera, who managed the part-time WCOTP office in Puerto Rico, made special efforts to increase the membership and participation of teachers' organizations in South America.

Peru

For my own personal targets I concentrated on Peru and Brazil. The teachers' organizations of Peru resemble those of several other South American countries in the intricate way they are organized and in the close entanglement of the teachers' organizations with the various political parties.

Example: When I was there in 1962 there were separate national federations of teachers in the elementary schools, the secondary schools, and the vocational schools. A National Education Federation very loosely linked the three organizations.

Example: This Federation had one President when I cabled to ask if I could visit them on the date suggested. By the time they could cable a reply another President had taken office, and by the time I reached Lima, still another.

Example: The technical teachers had decided to become members of WCOTP at one time, but their membership was swiftly nullified because those who had decided to affiliate, it was said, lacked authority to decide such a question.

Example: Thinking that Peru was centrally located as the site for a WCOTP branch office to serve South America, I asked several people about a suitable person to direct such an office. The invariable reply was, "No one from Peru! You can't find anyone who will not be assailed by some party or special interest. You should bring in someone from another country!"

Example: Several knowledgeable people strongly advised me to wait until the coming presidential elections before deciding whether to locate a WCOTP office in Lima.

I think one could fairly summarize my efforts in Peru as strenuous, persistent, and unfruitful.

Brazil

In Brazil I did better. In Sao Paulo I spent most of my time with the Centro do Profesorado Paulista (CPP), meeting its President, its Executive Committee, and its Board of Advisors.

The most important and useful discussion, however, was an informal talk with Dr. Solon Borges dos Rios, the President of CPP. I said that I liked and admired everything I saw and heard about the State organization in Sao Paulo but I would like to have its capable and strong leadership in a *national* organization which could represent all the teachers of Brazil in WCOTP.

Dr. Solon warned me that national unity is very difficult to achieve in Brazil. "Sao Paulo people including me, like to think they are important, but Sao Paulo is not Brazil." The Southern portion of Brazil was cool, cosmopolitan, two-thirds or more literate, and industrialized. The North was poor, remote, largely unknown, mostly illiterate.

North or South, the teachers led a regional life. Their schools in the main were regionally organized. Their school funds came mainly from State legislatures. Interstate communication and travel were difficult, expensive, and time-consuming.

I said I had heard of a meeting held in Brasilia about six months before which was intended to achieve national unity among teachers. On recalling that meeting Solon adopted, for the first time during that conversation, an optimistic outlook. He said that the meeting had indeed been held in January 1962. It had been, he said, the fifth in a series of meetings held over the past decade with the active assistance of the CPP. The new President was Donna Maria Elisa Viegas who lived in Recife, State of Pernambuco. He said he would arrange to have this lady meet me in Rio. The next morning I took a shuttle plane to that city.

During an entirely satisfactory conversation, Mrs. Viegas told me that the Confederation included the teachers' associations in each of Brazil's 20 states and four territories, that each member state paid the Confederation dues of 1,000 cruzeiros a month—"in principle." The headquarters office was located at Brasilia—"in principle" again. In fact, the headquarters of the organization were wherever Mrs. Viegas happened to be at the moment, and its staff consisted of whatever personnel she could extract from the four people who worked for her as the Director of Technical Education for Pernambuco. Her Executive Committee was to meet in about a month, and she had no doubt they would agree to file an application for WCOTP membership before the Stockholm Assembly. She was as good as her word. While no one would describe the Confederation as a fully united and effective organization, WCOTP did gain, and still has, a nationwide and quite representative membership in the largest country in Latin America.

Mexico: 1946-1959

I turn now to narrate one of my most serious failures—the long and ultimately unsuccessful experience of trying to get the Mexican Teachers Syndicate into WCOTP. It seemed at first to be an easily attainable goal. The Mexican Sindicato Nacional de Trabajadores en Enseñamza (SNTE) sent a delegation of three persons to Endicott in 1946 and these delegates signed the Constitution with a flourish. However, SNTE did not join—in fact, I do not recall any further significant correspondence from them.

In 1947 I went to Mexico for the first time, primarily to serve as a member of the United States Delegation to the General Conference of UNESCO. Since we were there about three weeks, I found time to call at the SNTE offices. I could see at once that the Syndicate was a powerful organization. Membership was compulsory for all public school teachers below the college level. The offices were large and well-located. It was evidently an organization worth cultivating. I also discovered (I think it was during this visit) that the delegates to Endicott had not made a good report and that the Syndicate was already affiliated with the Communist-directed international FISE. The SNTE in fact was, until joined by Cuba some twelve years later, the only organization in the Americas so affiliated. The leaders in the Syndicate offices were personally cordial to me but the commitment of their Syndicate to the Communist bloc had already been made. The Assembly of the Syndicate met only once in three years. The Executive Committee ran the organization in the meantime, and individual teachers knew little about their Syndicate and even less about its international affiliations.

Except for a short visit in 1956 to see the Mayan ruins around Merida, my next important contact with the Mexican teachers occurred in 1959. My wife and I spent three days in September in San Juan, Puerto Rico, attending the jubilant but dignified dedication of the newly-finished Hospital for Teachers built by the Puerto Rico Teachers Association. The PRTA had also invited to the same event delegations from the teachers' organizations of Latin America and the Caribbean. There was some talk about the possibility of a shift in direction of the Mexican teachers' organization. A Puerto Rican leader who had recently been in Mexico City told me that the SNTE officials felt that FISE had interfered in the internal politics of SNTE and that the Mexican teachers might even withdraw from FISE.

If this were true it would clearly be very important to WCOTP. I talked with each of the Mexican representatives in San Juan but was unable to secure a conclusive answer. At one point the head of the SNTE said emphatically that they did not really belong to FISE, but subsequent conversation revealed that he was not well-informed on their international contacts.

Early one morning, while we were still at breakfast in our room, one of the Mexican representatives knocked at our door. He had come, he said, to give me some samples of SNTE publications. My wife invited him to take coffee with us. I felt sure that he had come to explore the possibilities of establishing closer relations with NEA and WCOTP. We answered his questions and encouraged him to tell us all about the SNTE. At last he invited us to return to Washington via Mexico City. I replied that I couldn't do that and asked whether the best time to visit the SNTE might be at the time of their annual Council meeting. He replied that we would be welcome at any time. I said that it would help me to have a written formal invitation to discuss with my Executive Committee.

A few weeks later the letter arrived. We were cordially invited to attend the annual Council of SNTE in Mexico City beginning November 24, 1959.

When we arrived we found that the Council meeting would not begin until November 27 and that it was to be held in Queretaro, a provincial capital about four hours drive northwest of Mexico City. While we were still in Mexico City we were told that one of the local units of the Syndicate—the elementary school teachers in Mexico City itself—was engaged in a dispute with the Executive of SNTE. It was difficult for an outsider to form an accurate opinion about the specific causes of this dispute. One of the causes, but not the primary one, was the presence of the *Norteamericano Carr y su* *esposa* as officially invited guests of the Syndicate, especially since no one was in attendance from FISE. It was reported to me that busloads of the dissidents were expected to come from the capital city to break up the Queretaro meeting. This much was certainly true, for I saw the dissidents and their tactics with my own eyes. It was also freely reported that the expenses for the chartered buses had been provided by contacts with the Soviet Embassy in Mexico City. This report remains unsubstantiated, but in the light of other experiences over many years, I am inclined to believe it.

I do know that when we went to the Queretaro Auditorium assigned for the SNTE meeting we found that some 50 people had arrived early. Nearly all of these early birds, I was told, were dissidents from Mexico City, not accredited delegates. They were seated in an unusual way, too. The aisle seats were all occupied. This would have meant that the delegates who might wish to go to the platform and to use the microphone could easily be stopped or at least greatly hampered by those who might not wish them to speak.

After looking over this scene, I was told by our assigned guide to come quietly along with him because the site of the Council meeting had been changed. So we walked about a half-mile from the Auditorium, knocked on a large wooden gateway and entered a spacious courtyard where all the real delegates had gathered. We then all trooped indoors to a small social hall which had been hurriedly equipped with rows of movable folding chairs and the Council meeting, only about two hours late, began. This was, in fact, the regional office of SNTE in Queretaro and of the local Teachers Club.

When I was called on to offer greetings from WCOTP, I took occasion to outline briefly the scope and program of WCOTP, as well as its apolitical nature. I found a way to mention in passing that the Mexican observers had signed the original WOTP Constitution in Endicott. I recalled my surprise upon learning that the Mexican teachers had decided instead to affiliate with the Soviet teachers. The expression of blank astonishment on the faces of the Council delegates convinced me that the communist affiliation of the Mexican teachers was not really understood by the Council members, much less by the rank and file, In closing, I expressed the hope that the teachers of Mexico, in their own way and in their own time, would affiliate to WCOTP, "the only major international organization which, avoiding all religious and political alliances, devotes itself directly to the improvement of the status of teachers and teaching."

Meanwhile the patient guardians of the microphones back at the Auditorium must have discovered at last that the venue of the Council had been changed. They could be heard screaming in the street outside and banging away at the heavy wooden doors to the patio, the only way into the building. There was only one window on the street in the meeting hall. This window was protected by an ornamental but substantial wrought-iron grill. I could see the "opposition" through that window, climbing up the grill and peering into the hall.

We broke for lunch about three o'clock that afternoon. Some person or persons unknown, presumably the local constabulary, had required the demonstrators to move to the sidewalk on the other side of the street. From that vantage point some of the remaining dissidents shouted their disapproval of the Establishment. I was told that some of their remarks were personally uncomplimentary to me and other Yankee imperialists within the range of their voices. When I asked my interpreter (our old friend, José Rivera of Puerto Rico) just what they had said he blushed and said he couldn't tell me. To this day he has not told me, but I have made some educated guesses.

Mexico: 1960-63

When I later asked the Syndicate officers about the action taken on WCOTP affiliation, they told me, for the first time, that the Annual Council was not authorized to take such action. This could only be done by the Assembly which was held only every three years; the Assembly had voted for the FISE affiliation and only the Assembly could change it.

In July 1962 I was urged by SNTE to come to Mexico City. Very pressed for time just then, I nevertheless flew down for two days. Leaving aside peripheral matters, the purpose of the meeting was to make a definite plan for the WCOTP affiliation of SNTE.

I said that the SNTE was the recognized and unchallenged leader of teachers' organizations throughout Latin America. The Brazilian teachers who had just joined WCOTP were more numerous but much less influential. I recognized that where SNTE led the rest of the Latin American teachers would probably follow. I had come to Mexico to deliver a personal invitation to the new SNTE Secretary-General to lead his organization into WCOTP.

Mr. Robles agreed that SNTE should join WCOTP and, he felt sure, would do so at an opportune moment. However, he said only the SNTE Assembly could make that decision and that would not occur until its next meeting in 1964 or 1965. Meanwhile SNTE could send observers to WCOTP.

I said that to await the next triennial Assembly left us all exactly where we had been for years. WCOTP has always invited SNTE to send observers to its meetings and they usually came, receiving a large part of the benefits of a member without carrying any of the responsibility.

Mr. Larios said that perhaps the act of affiliation could be taken by the next session of the Council in May 1963.

I said that we still had in our files the signatures of the three Mexican delegates to Endicott on the WOTP Constitution. Their delegates had in fact already helped to shape the Constitution. One could argue plausibly that the subsequent action to join FISE was either invalid or an open rebuke to their 1946 delegates.

On this happy thought we adjourned for lunch. During this break I drafted an aide-memoire, with texts in both English and Spanish.

After further discussion, Larios and I both signed the following document:

MEMORANDUM

> The S.N.T.E. has received a cordial invitation to affiliate to W.C.O.T.P. as a full national member. This invitation was conveyed most recently by means of a personal visit by the Secretary-General of W.C.O.T.P., Dr. William G. Carr, Secretary-General Sr. Robles Martinez of F.S.T.E. being present, to Secretary-General Sr. Larios of S.N.T.E. in Mexico City on July 16, 1962.
>
> Professor Larios Gaytan, after examining the aims and programs of W.C.O.T.P. decided to establish immediately close cooperation with W.C.O.T.P. and he will recommend to the next meeting of the National Council of S.N.T.E. in May, 1963, the affiliation of S.N.T.E. as a full national member of W.C.O.T.P.

> In order that the membership of S.N.T.E. in W.C.O.T.P. may be effective before the 1963 meeting of W.C.O.T.P. in August, the Executive of W.C.O.T.P. will in August, 1962 act upon the membership of S.N.T.E. in advance, the membership to become effective immediately upon favorable action by the S.N.T.E. Council.

At Stockholm in August the WCOTP Executive took the action required by the above memorandum. The five observers from SNTE left the Stockholm Conference after two days. They did not advise me of their premature departure but sent word that they must return to Mexico at once because of urgent SNTE business. However, in spite of the urgent business, the observers made visits of several days' duration in Paris, Madrid, and Rome on their way home.

In May, 1963, the Council of SNTE met on the barely accessible island of Cozumel which is rapidly becoming one of the most delightful vacation spots in Mexico. I was told at once that they would not keep their part of the agreement we signed on July 16, 1962. There was too much resistance from some delegates, too much loyalty to the long established affiliation with FISE. Not enough personal contacts had been possible yet. It was clear that either (1) whatever may have caused Mssrs. Robles and Larios to sign on the dotted line a few months earlier was no longer present; or (2) FISE had set in motion some effective counter moves.

I asked if the Council at Cozumel could vote to recommend a change in affiliation to the 1964 Triennial meeting of the Assembly. Of course this suggestion was turned aside, too. I almost took the next plane back to Washington. However, in those days there were only three flights a week out of Cozumel. I might as well wait for the SNTE chartered flight.

We arrived in Cozumel about 10 in the morning. The first session was scheduled for 5 p.m., began at 6:15 and adjourned at 10:15.

No general meetings were scheduled for the next morning, the time being set aside for "working committees." I do not believe a single committee met. Everyone was either sleeping or enjoying the clear waters of the Caribbean. At a luncheon that day I was made an honorary life member of the Sindicato. The afternoon was spent like the morning. A second general session in the evening started almost an hour late and consisted almost wholly of extravagantly laudatory speeches for almost everyone at the head table.

The final day of the Conference was a "free day" and we all returned to Mexico City in the chartered plane late in the evening.

The next day the Council was received by President Lopez Mateos in order that he might be told all that had been accomplished at Cozumel.

There were 53 delegates to the Council. I do not know what it cost the SNTE to assemble all those Council members, transport them on a three hour flight and maintain them for four days in resort hotels—all for not more than two or three hours of meaningful deliberation.

Academic, economic, professional and social

The theme of the Rio Assembly of WCOTP was "Conditions of Work for Quality Teaching." The Canadian Teachers Federation contributed to the discussion a synthesis of the reports on the theme from the member organizations. The French Elementary School Teachers Syndicate, which by this time was represented on the WCOTP Executive Committee, gave a lucid introduction to the Conference Theme. The Conference itself considered, partly through the use of four smaller discussion groups, the *academic, economic, professional* and *social* conditions for quality teaching.

The Danish Minister of Education, Mr. Helveg Petersen, delivered to the Assembly a special address on "Education For International Understanding."

I was particularly pleased by the successful efforts of Mrs. Viegas to bring a large number of Brazilian teachers, including some teachers in training, to observe this, the first WCOTP Assembly in South America.

PARIS, 1964

Our relations with the French teachers' organizations continued to improve. The turning point was, I believe, the election of M. Forestiere to the Executive Committee and, as a result, the assumption by the French Syndicates of teachers of increasing responsibilities for the continued success of the Confederation. In an organization, as in many a schoolroom, it is often effective to give a highly critical member some definite corporate responsibility. No general rule of group behavior is completely applicable under all conditions. It is still unwise to put a wolf in charge of the flock. It is always important and usually difficult to tell whether you are petting a wolf or a watchdog. However, when the French teachers invited WCOTP to meet in Paris in 1964 the invitation was quickly and avidly accepted.

In the year between Rio and Paris, 1963-1964, the WCOTP activities continued to expand in various ways. In addition to general oversight at the Washington office, I was personally involved in two of these activities.

Day-by-day

In November, 1963, WCOTP continued its efforts to assist the Latin American teachers' organizations by a Seminar in Puerto Rico on teachers' housing. It was always difficult for me to present the work of WCOTP as a continuing service. So much attention is naturally concentrated on the large annual Assembly that the everyday ongoing program of service is often forgotten or ignored. I decided to try to stress the continuing program by my opening remarks at the Puerto Rico Seminar. For illustrative purpose, I will quote what I said on that point:

> Every day of the year some representative of the World Confederation is participating in an international activity of significance to education. Let me use the first half of November to illustrate what I mean. On the *2nd and 3rd* of this month, the President of the Confederation and the Director of the Paris office were in Switzerland for a conference of primary teachers' associations. At the same time, the WCOTP coordinator for Asian affairs was in Tokyo with the WCOTP member associations. From the *7th to the 13th*, the President of the International Council on Education for Teaching, one of the WCOTP international affiliates, visited Paris and Teheran on his way to New Delhi. On the *9th and 10th* the four member organizations in East Africa—from Uganda, Kenya, Tanganyika, and Zanzibar—held a special conference to further regional cooperation; the Ghanian Director of the WCOTP Accra office flew to Dar-es-Salaam to assist at this meeting and then proceeded to

visit other member organizations in East and Central Africa. From November *11 to 15* four representatives of WCOTP were in Paris at a UNESCO sponsored conference on audiovisual aids. From the *13th to 16th* a member of the WCOTP Executive Committee was in Rome for the conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization on the Freedom-from-Hunger Campaign. The Secretary General of the Arab Teachers Federation was in Washington during this period and held several talks with WCOTP officials on the future development of its program in the Arabic-speaking countries. This in the briefest possible form, is what was happening whilst you were travelling to San Juan and our hosts here were preparing this Seminar. If I analyzed any other two-week period in the year the list would be similar in scope and variety.

The Seminar had been well organized by the Director of the WCOTP office in San Juan, Mr. José Joaquin Rivera. We had 160 people at the opening session, representing teachers' organizations of Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Nicaragua, Panama, El Salvador, Uruguay, and the Dominican Republic. It became clear that the improvement of the highly unsatisfactory condition of teachers' housing was a problem shared by nearly all the Latin American teachers. At the opening session two good technical papers were presented and an hour's discussion from the floor followed.

The afternoon session was just getting off to a good start when I was called out of the meeting room. The secretary at the registration desk, expecting to have little to do that afternoon, had brought along her small transistor radio. The musical program had been interrupted, she said, by news that President Kennedy had been fired upon as he rode through the streets of Dallas. Then, a few minutes later, came the confirming word. The President was dead. It was absurd, unthinkable, incredible. I had seen and talked with the young President, so buoyant and magnetic, at the White House less than a week before.

What should be done about the Seminar in the next room, still engaged in a lively discussion? I could not trust my Spanish to make such a dreadful announcement; indeed, I could barely have done it in English. I requested Mr. Rivera to interrupt the meeting and to make the announcement. The Seminar would be adjourned for the day. All social events, including that afternoon's visit to the Rivera's home, were cancelled for the rest of the Seminar. The Conference was stunned. The Latin American delegates said they would withdraw to another room to draft a statement of condolence. Since I was the only North American present, the delegates, before they left, came to me, one by one, to exchange a silent handshake or *un abrazo.*

I tried unsuccessfully to telephone my wife whom I had left in a Washington hospital to undergo preparation for extensive and dangerous surgery after my scheduled return from San Juan. José telephoned his wife in San Juan. She had heard the news on her home television and was on (or over) the edge of tears. "You and Dr. Carr," she said, "had better get here right away. What am I to do with freshly-made sandwiches in the icebox for 150 people?"

The Conference continued for a few more hours the next day, but the momentum had been lost. I returned early to Washington.

Paris potpourri

I spent the first weeks of May 1964 in Europe, mostly in Paris, engaged in a wide variety of activities, including:

(a) Addressing the Overseas Education Association in Munich. (The OEA is composed primarily of teachers in the schools maintained in various parts of the world for the dependents of Defense Department employees.)

(b) Conferring with Ben Brodinsky of Connecticut, an expert in Educational Journalism who was selected by WCOTP to respond to the request of the Israel Teachers Union for advice regarding the ITU publications.

(c) Presiding over the UNESCO Expert Conference on the Status of Teachers.

(d) Discussions with: Rene Maheu, the Director-General of UNESCO; the Director of its Educational Planning Institute, Philip Coombs; various members of the UNESCO Secretariat and Executive Board; the United States Permanent Representative to UNESCO, William Benton, and members of his staff. All of these UNESCO-related discussions were aimed at securing a greater recognition of the "E" in UNESCO and a greater recognition of teachers as the most important part of "E."

(e) Discussions about the programs of the French Teachers Syndicates, including arrangements for the 1964 Assembly of WCOTP in Paris.
(f) Evaluation of the WCOTP branch office in Paris.
(g) Attending the meeting of the WCOTP Liaison Committee with representatives of FISE.

I need say nothing more about points (a), (b), (d), (e), and (f) in the above list.

Continued work on the status of teachers

Point (c), the UNESCO Expert Conference on the Status of Teachers, has already been mentioned in these memoirs.

The background and content of the meeting need not be repeated. A review of the UNESCO records at that time showed that I was the first American to be elected Chairperson of a UNESCO Conference of this type since 1956. The meeting itself ran very smoothly. I tried to be impartial. I found, in return as it were, that the experts from the USSR and Hungary were cooperative. They seemed to be as anxious as anyone else to prepare a good conference report—always, of course, within the framework of their understanding of the political and social role of teachers.

The exception to this rule was a young Chilean Communist named Angel Pizarro. He had formerly been a Secretary-General of FISE and he carried a chip on each shoulder. He complained that the Chilean Government did not inform him about UNESCO activities. He had the vocabulary at his command. Teachers are members of the working class. They should all be militant syndicalists. Teachers should be recruited from among the poor and the exploited for they alone could understand oppression.

One last try for liaison

For the meeting of our representatives with those of FISE, we in WCOTP made careful preparation. The agenda, as agreed upon in advance, contained two items: (1) how to assist the UNESCO project on mutual understanding of the cultures of East and West; and (2) a point-by-point comparison of the publications of WCOTP and FISE.

Our Liaison Committee was broadly representative of WCOTP members:

Sir Ronald Gould, Chairperson (England)

Mrs. Sarah Caldwell (U.S.A.)
Tai Si Chung (Korea)
M. Denis Forestiere (France)
Shri Natarajan (India)

Mr. A. W. S. Hutchings (FIPESO)
M. Robert Michel (IFTA)

Dr. William G. Carr (Secretary-General)
Herr Wilhelm Ebert (WCOTP Paris Office)

To meet us on behalf of FISE came Paul Delanoue and Mlle. Helene Dazy, President and Secretary-General of FISE, both residents in Paris, and Sergei Romanov, USSR, who was in Paris anyway as an expert at the UNESCO meeting on the Status of Teachers which had just adjourned. Thus WCOTP had nine conferees assembled at considerable expense from all parts of the world, whilst FISE had only three local officials. Furthermore, it quickly became clear that, although we had made very careful preparations, the FISE delegation was "playing by ear," without preparation or documentation.

On Agenda item 1, FISE insisted that WCOTP lead off. We described the salient points of the WCOTP program on East-West relations: the 1959 WCOTP Assembly theme, our special study of primary school textbooks conducted for UNESCO, our regional conferences in Asia (Kuala Lampur, Bangkok and Saigon), our sponsorship of the great series of books entitled "Man Through His Art," teaching materials about the United Nations, and the WCOTP preparation and distribution of children's books such as "Your Friends in France," "Your Friends in Japan," and so forth.

Romanov asked whether WCOTP would be willing to have such publications translated and made available to children in China and the USSR Delanoue changed the subject before we could reply. This was the first of many illustrations during the two-day conference indicating a lack of common policy in the FISE delegation.

Sir Ronald urged FISE to describe its program on East-West relations, as we had just presented the WCOTP program.

Romanov's first words in reply were, "We haven't done much." He said FISE had a contract with UNESCO to evaluate teaching materials about the Orient used in the middle schools of three small Communist countries. Miss Dazy said that some of the national member organizations in FISE had compiled materials on this theme.

There was a long pause. Sir Ronald at last said, "Well, has FISE anything else to report?" After another long silence, tea and coffee were served and the meeting adjourned until morning.

It was agreed to begin the next morning with the FISE report on agenda item 2, the publications of the two organizations. We insisted that FISE should lead off the presentation on this topic.

FISE reported that its chief publication was *Teachers of the World,* a magazine published about twice a year in English, French, German, and Japanese, in a printing of about 10,000 copies in each language, except the German edition of which fewer copies were printed. They also published a bulletin called *The Teachers' Courier* every two months.

All the WCOTP participants had seen at least occasional copies of *Teachers of the World* but none of us had ever seen the *Courier.* We learned that its purpose was "just news." It was issued only in French and English.

It surprised us, we said, that FISE publications are not issued in the languages of the vast majority of its members. Were they intended primarily for external use? Miss Dazy of FISE replied that they did not address themselves only to their own members.

This apparently completed the FISE discussion on publications. WCOTP then presented very briefly (about ten minutes) all its publications, distributing examples of the publications as the list went on:

Reports on the Annual Theme
Proceedings of the Annual Assembly
Panorama - monthly (at that time)
Echo - the WCOTP newsletter, 6 to 8 times a year
Regional Studies on the Status of Teachers
Special Studies, such as the international comparison of teachers' salaries.
Proceedings of the Regional Conferences, 2 or 3 times a year
Publications on Teacher Education
Publications on Health and Physical Education
Publications on the Teaching of Reading
Annual Reports of IFTA
Annual Reports of FIPESO

The WCOTP Annual Calendar
Special reports on teachers' housing projects
The series entitled, "Man Through His Art"
The series entitled, "Our Friends in . . ."
Films
Filmstrips

At the conclusion, the FISE delegation asked no questions and offered no comments. Having completed its agenda, the meeting adjourned, well before lunch.

This was the last meeting with FISE delegations that I attended. The proposed exchange of publications was not implemented because I could never secure a list of the names and addresses of FISE members. The FISE Secretary-General told me later that many FISE members were underground organizations and their members were likely to be persecuted if they received a magazine from the United States. I said that we could have the magazine mailed from New Delhi. Too dangerous, I was told, the fascist dictatorships in those countries would not be deceived. They would know where the magazine was printed. I suggested that FISE remove from the mailing lists the names of any national member organizations for which receipt of a foreign magazine would be considered dangerous. That, too, was declined.

East Berlin

We discussed the possibility of exchanging observers at our annual meetings. When FISE organized a meeting in East Berlin I sent a well-qualified observer to represent WCOTP. He was barred not only from the meeting room but also from the building in which the meeting room was located so that he had no opportunity even for social contacts.

Membership in WCOTP is open to the teachers' organizations of any country and I believe that at least for the time being, this is the only channel by which useful contact is likely to be inaugurated.

UNESCO revisited

Two months after I left the FISE-WCOTP nonconference, I was back in Paris for the 1964 WCOTP Assembly of Delegates.

The most important advantage for WCOTP in holding the Assembly in Paris was the new and stronger relation that the Confederation could establish with UNESCO. This was the controlling factor in all our arrangements. The Assembly Theme for 1964, "Increasing International Understanding Through Teaching About the United Nations," had been selected with this thought in mind. The Assembly documentation included reports on this subject by 50 national member organizations in Europe, the Americas, Asia, Africa, and Oceania. A summary of these reports was contributed by the German Teachers Organization. An introduction to the theme was presented by the Costa Rica Teachers Organization. The four discussion groups dealt with the basic Assembly theme from the viewpoint of primary schools, secondary schools, teacher education, and adult education.

The official observer from the United Nations New York Headquarters spoke in praise of WCOTP goals and methods of work in teaching international understanding. Films on the United Nations and on its International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF) were shown.

The Director of the WCOTP Paris office gave a detailed but concise review of recent cooperation between WCOTP and UNESCO.

Above all, the welcoming speech of Rene Maheu, the Director-General of UNESCO, and his letter which supplemented it, made it clear that henceforth UNESCO would seriously consult WCOTP on all matters to which teachers might be able to make a significant professional input.

On the administrative side, the fact that the large and impressive Assembly Hall in the UNESCO Headquarters was used for WCOTP meetings was an immense psychological advantage.

At the Paris Assembly the Teachers Syndicate of the United Arab Republic with its 120,000 individual members was formally admitted to WCOTP membership, along with the Syndicate of Technical Teachers of France (15,000), the Syndicate of Secondary Teachers of Lebanon (7,000), the Jamaica Teachers Union (6,000), and smaller teachers' organizations in Bermuda (350), El Salvador (1,000), and Singapore (Chinese Teachers, 4,000). This brought total membership in WCOTP to 141 national members in 87 countries, and 54 associate members in Uruguay, Peru, England, Hong Kong, Philippines, Brazil, Japan, Chad, and the United States.

A number of important by-law changes were made but they do not provide stimulating reading. Perhaps the most important change was to limit Executive Committee members in the future to two two-year elective terms. The Confederation lost some valuable experienced assistance in this way but with the growing number of members it seemed best, on balance, to involve more people from more countries in the process of governing the Confederation.

After the Paris meeting my wife and I went off to a two-week vacation in the Black Forest. Thence we went to Berlin where I met again some of the local people with whom I had been involved in connection with the Berlin Wall inquiry and enjoyed a brief reunion with Dr. and Mrs. Conant. Among other reasons, Dr. Conant was in Berlin to advise the Berlin Government in its decision to set up an important Pedagogical Center there.

ADDIS ABABA, 1965

The first WCOTP meeting in Africa was a high-risk enterprise. The usual problems of meeting space, hotel rooms, transportation, and so forth were difficult but manageable. Our basic problem was that our host-member, the Ethiopian Teachers Organization (ETO) was moribund. Accordingly, Bennett Caulley, the Director of the WCOTP Africa office, was sent to Addis Ababa to get the organization into shape to act as host to a large international meeting. He succeeded admirably so that he helped both WCOTP and the ETO.

Haile Selassie

The day after we arrived my wife and I were received by the Emperor. I was able to give him fresh news about President Johnson's White House Conference on Education which had just been completed.

The next day I went with Mr. Caulley to the small house which the Government had just given the ETO. There I met and addressed about 30 ETO directors, two from each province, who were getting an intensive course in conference operations and their respective areas of responsibility.

The WCOTP meetings were held in Africa Hall, a splendid marble building erected primarily to serve as the headquarters of the Organization for African Unity. The Emperor was by that time engaged in a long-term prearranged state visit in Kenya. However, he sent us a message which the Minister of State for Education read. He commended especially the 1965 WCOTP Theme: "Equal Opportunity Through Education." He said that Ethiopia is moving toward political stability and greater well-being for all its people. Before such a task can be undertaken, he said, "the tool must be prepared, and education is the tool." In moving a formal vote of thanks for the message, I repeated the last four words, "education is the tool" and added, "Surely equal opportunity is the cutting edge of that tool."

Equality opportunity in education

The Assembly discussed equality of opportunity in education with serious attention to both theoretical and practical problems. Discussion groups considered factors related to the students': (1) socio-economic background, (2) health and personality, and (3) intellectual capacity and aptitudes.

During the opening "general debate" on the Theme, the delegate of the Irish National Teachers Organization suggested that progress toward equality of opportunity for education should be regularly reviewed every three to five years. This idea of a regular review of equality of opportunity by WCOTP was widely accepted and included in the Resolutions of the Assembly. The five-year review was held in 1970

Two more Arab teachers' organizations (those in Sudan and Tunisia) were admitted to membership at the Addis Ababa Assembly, as well as the 16,000-member National Union of Ecuador Teachers and smaller organizations from Bahamas, Dahomey, Italy, Senegal, and Singapore.

During the years when we were trying to persuade the Arab teachers' syndicates to join WCOTP, the Arabs had often used the WCOTP membership of the Israel Teachers Union as a reason for the Arabs not to join. I argued in reply that Israeli membership was the best of all reasons for the Arabs to join. Although the discussion of political issues was not permitted by the WCOTP Constitution, many informal opportunities arose during any WCOTP meeting for the Arab viewpoint on Middle East issues to be heard.

Now that the Arabs were actually joining WCOTP, it was natural to expect an Israeli reaction to their presence. Fortunately all the questions raised by the Israel teachers could be easily answered. For example, I received a vigorous protest that while the flags of the UAR, Tunisia, and the Sudan were flying in front of the meeting hall, the flag of Israel was not shown. I explained that we were meeting in the headquarters of the Organization for African Unity and that the protocol for this building (as well as the number of flag poles) called for the display only of the flags of African countries. That is why, I said, you do not see the Star of David, Canada misses the Maple Leaf, and I the Stars and Stripes.

In discussing the WCOTP program for the coming year we had one more fling at the old question of relations between FISE and WCOTP. Mr. Stephen Kioni, Secretary of the Kenya National Teachers Union and one of my partners in the 1961 study of the Berlin Wall, said:

> I wish to speak about the part of the 1966 program which refers to WCOTP relationships with other international groups. The FISE is not a world organization. It is a sectional organization of the socialist countries. I take strong exception to the way in which FISE came through Africa trying to recruit our national teachers' organizations. I think the African teachers are very happy with our relations to WCOTP. We can see from the Algiers Conference, sponsored by FISE, that this organization invariably introduces a strong element of politics into their discussions.
>
> We should urge the members of FISE–Poland, East Germany, etc.–to join WCOTP. We feel sorry for them. They don't know what they are missing.

Soon after the meeting ended we went with Kioni on a short flight to Nairobi, When I met our Ambassador to Kenya, Mr. William Attwood, I was pleased and surprised to find that he already knew about Kioni's speech in Addis Ababa. Only a few United States Ambassadors in my experience, follow matters as vigorously and thoroughly as did Ambassador Attwood. He was looking forward to his return to private life in the near future. He was and is a remarkable citizen as anyone will discover who reads his book on his experiences as Ambassador to Guinea and Kenya–*The Reds and the Blacks.*

Arab teachers in Alexandria

From Nairobi we flew by late plane back across the equator to Cairo where we were cheerfully met on the steps of the airport (at 3 a.m.!) by Mr. Mohammed. We were driven the next evening to Alexandria where the WCOTP observers were the only non-Arabs at the conference on the teaching of science sponsored by the Federation of Arab Teachers Syndicates (FATS). About 700 delegates were in attendance, but they were almost invisible when compared to the multiplied and uncountable thousands of vacationers, mostly Egyptian, who occupied every inch of the beach, the sidewalks, the hotels, the restaurants of this ancient city. We spent several days there and came to know a little of its remaining monuments of the days when Alexandria rivalled the glories of Athens and the grandeurs of Rome.

At the opening session spokespersons for the participating Arab states made introductory statements: Sudan, Syria, Iraq (over 100 delegates present), UAR, Kuwait, Lebanon, Mauritania, Yemen, and Palestine. They saved me for their anchorperson.

The UAR Minister of Education announced the next day that beginning in 1965-66, English would become a compulsory second language in Egyptian secondary schools.

The meetings at Addis Ababa, Nairobi, Cairo, and Alexandria had been extremely exhausting, with a dozen or so fixed appointments every day. We decided to visit Berne, Switzerland for a week's rest on the way home.

Santo Domingo

I do not suppose any large international organization has ever spent as much time and money to assist the teachers of so small a country as WCOTP did for those of the Dominican Republic.

The teachers' organization of the Republic, for which the Spanish acronym is FENEMA, was formed in 1962, the year after the assassination of Dictator Trujillo. We took the FENEMA President to the Rio Assembly in August 1963. The President of the Republic, Juan Bosch, was ousted by an army coup in September, 1963, and FENEMA was soon in trouble with the Triumvirate, as the new government was called. On three occasions in 1964 WCOTP staff members went to Santo Domingo to try to help. WCOTP arranged and paid for a National Seminar on Teachers Organizations in September 1964. In April 1965 there was a revolution against the Triumvirate, followed by the arrival there of United States forces and a Pan-American Peace Force.

In October 1965 I decided to have a look at the situation myself, picking up on the way José Rivera, of Puerto Rico, as my assistant and interpreter.

We were met at the airport by Fernando Hernandez Diaz and José Frank Garcia, President and Secretary, respectively, of FENEMA. They had borrowed a friend's car for the morning.

There were more than the usual contingents of police and soldiers at the airport. We were stopped and our baggage rechecked at a military checkpoint about halfway to the city. We crossed the Puente Duarte, the site of one of the most bitter skirmishes of the Civil War (over 100 killed, 200 wounded), and we saw the radio tower and other shell-torn buildings nearby.

There was nothing alarming about the presence of heavily-armed men except the careless nonchalance of the Dominican soldiers as they toyed with their rifles and machine guns. I should think the number of accidental gunshot wounds was very high. It is difficult for any soldier to search a car, its gear, and its passengers with a rifle (grasped by the barrel) in one hand, and documents in the other, especially while smoking a cigarette.

We began serious conversations at the hotel on arrival. The current situation of FENEMA was as follows:

a) Fifteen percent of the nation's 12,000 teachers lived in the capital city. They were all inaccessible because the city schools were closed *again*.

b) The teachers suffer so much from debt and widespread unemployment that collection of dues is almost impossible.

c) The Association needed a car of some kind so that the President could visit the members. It also needed money for office rent (the Government paid part of it), and for the replacement of stolen or damaged office equipment and supplies.

d) The Advisory Board of the Ministry of Education, on which FENEMA was supposed to have three seats, had been inactive for months.

e) Dues, if collectible at all, were payable in monthly installments at a fixed percent of salary. Teachers' salaries were about one month in arrears.

f) The annual Congress of Delegates should be held by FENEMA in order to elect officers and formulate programs. This Congress should meet about four days in a town outside Santo

Domingo in order to minimize political involvement. There were no funds for such a conference.

g) Although proposals for better social security for teachers might be successful, a push for higher salaries would fail in view of the nation's economic difficulties.

In the afternoon, we were joined by a group of FENEMA leaders from Salcedo and San Francisco de Macoris. I asked them how their daily work was affected and they replied to this effect:

(1) We need stability–the children, the teachers, everybody.

(2) We are in a tragic situation. Neither Bosch nor Balaguer is a suitable leader. But we won't give up to dictatorship again.

(3) Teachers have lost much of their authority and prestige. There is much truancy. Children of 8 to 10, even, are enlisted in the various political associations. By the time they reach secondary schools, political meetings and demonstrations are a way of life. They think teachers are "reactionaries," and don't want their advice.

(4) There is great need for organized recreation and reading materials for children and youth. There are practically no playgrounds or libraries.

(5) Teachers need inservice education; few have had proper training. Two-thirds are unqualified even by the low Dominican standards.

(6) Schools in the provinces have absolutely no medical service. We have first-aid kits and a supply of medicines in the schools. The teachers use these if a child is ill in school.

Question:	Have you had first-aid training?
Answer:	Not at all.
Question:	How do you decide what medicine to give?
Answer:	Oh, we learn by experience!

The barbed wire

In the afternoon, I took a long trip to every part of the city, except the "rebel territory" which civilians are not supposed to enter. The border of the rebel territory was marked by barbed wire entanglements in which there are occasional checkpoints, well-guarded, for entry and exit of authorized persons. At one point, the "border" runs down the middle of the street, and I saw two small boys, residents of opposite sides of the street, cheerfully playing catch across the barbed wire barrier.

Those admitted past the checkpoints were carefully searched for weapons by the Dominican police and army. I saw a long line of people early Monday morning waiting to be searched, presumably on their way to work in other sections of the city.

The area surrounded by the barbed wire steadily decreased. There was a house-by-house search for concealed weapons. When a block became "clean" in this respect, the barbed wire was moved. This was a slow process. The Dominicans thought it would take months; all were darkly convinced that large amounts of weapons were not revealed.

I visited one school that was occupied by United States soldiers. This elementary school was heavily damaged. A small cannon shooting at close range through heavy steel venetian blinds, had left grotesque metal work hanging around the window frames. This particular school was formerly occupied by rebel soldiers who used its second-floor windows to shoot at the United States forces.

Of the original twenty-four classrooms, only four were usable for school purposes. The others were either too badly damaged or were used by the United States Army. At the moment, however, this was not important since all schools in the city were closed.

I left Santo Domingo with a feeling of immense discouragement. I did manage to do one useful thing. I did not like to see American soldiers occupying a school building. When I returned to Washington I talked with several officials about this. I understand that the troops were soon withdrawn from the school after they had done everything they could to prepare it for occupancy by the Santo Domingo children and teachers.

International Cooperation Year

One other event of international interest in 1965 should be mentioned. The year 1965 was designated by the United Nations as International Cooperation Year. President Johnson organized a White House Conference on the topic as part of the observance of this year in the United States. I was named Chairperson of the Conference Committee on Education and Training, organized four planning meetings of this Committee, and presided over the appropriate sections of the White House Conference itself.

12 WCOTP: 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969

Seoul–Hokkaido and Nagano - No visa for Korea? - Korean hospitality and recovery - UNESCO literacy committee - The Iranian program - Vancouver - Fiscal problems - Individual problems - Dublin - Reflections in San Francisco - Universal Declaration - Further financial discussions - Abidjan - Manila - Djakarta - Madras - Iran: grandeur and glitter - Kidnapped! - Cairo - Tunis - Edinburgh - Abidjan attendance - Sydney meeting plans - Accra: visual aids - Alexandria revisited - Inaugrual session - Working Party No. 6 - Reception - Plenary session - Evaluation - Island in the sun - Island in the mist - European regional conference.

SEOUL, 1966

On our way to the 1966 WCOTP Assembly in Seoul, my wife and I were kindly invited by the Japan Teachers Union to spend a week in their country.

Hokkaido and Nagano

We began with three days in the northern island of Hokkaido, accompanied by Mr. Ooshika whom we had first met at the Manila meeting of WCOTP in 1956. We visited the principal city of the prefecture, Sapporo, a city later viewed on television by almost all the world during the winter Olympics. The whole countryside, the extinct craters, the hot springs, the narrow passages through steeply-towering mountains reminded one of those Japanese scroll paintings where craggy heights, waterfalls, and widening rivers come together in such a way as to focus the viewer's attention on something human and small—a thatched hut, a castle, an old man fishing, or a small arched bridge.

During our days together in Hokkaido, I had the opportunity to become rather well acquainted with Mr. Ooshika. At the University at Sapporo, and on the streets of the city, he pointed out to me a number of demonstrators passing out documents, carrying placards, and camping on the campus.

We next spent 24 hours in Nagano. The Shinano Education Association has been an associate member of WCOTP since the Malta meeting of 1951. Its leading officials met us at the train. They took us to a pleasant old-style Japanese inn where other members of the Association were assembled, including all of the delegates who had been to the previous WCOTP meetings. The Shinano Education Association has financed a delegate to every meeting since 1951, and it was good to see these men again, and all at once this time. After introductions, during which each man recalled some particular event of interest in the WCOTP meeting that he had attended, we proceeded to a leisurely sitdown dinner.

The word "sit-down" is to be understood in its most basic sense. We sat on the floor. Our dinner was served with many courses on small straw mats also on the floor. When we retired for the night we slept on larger mats placed directly on the floor.

The Shinano Education Association appears to be the lengthened shadow of a remarkable person, Hiromu Matsuoka, its President. He first brought the organization into WCOTP in 1951, and has not attended another meeting since then, holding that this opportunity should be shared among as many members as possible. Every time I have visited Tokyo, however, Mr. Matsuoka has made the long trip by train from Nagano to see me. I mean *see;* he doesn't speak twenty words of English.

The Japan Teachers Union had a branch office in Nagano. There appears to be no hostility between the two organizations. The Shinano Education Association has 1200 members. It includes teachers, principals, supervisors, and administrators. Its yearly dues are 2500 yen, plus a variable fee for each of the smaller local units into which it is divided. The yearly budget is 48 million yen. The Association owns three buildings. One is used for general administration, one for welfare activities, and one for printing. The welfare building includes a dormitory for teachers who have occasion to stay overnight in the prefectural capital.

The Association operates a research and training program for its members. In connection with the local administration, it has secured leaves of absence by which over 200 leaders of the organization have had advanced professional educational training in recent years. Almost all the elementary teachers in the prefecture as well as large numbers of secondary teachers belong to the Association. Many professors of education in the universities and colleges are members. The welfare program includes housing loans, death benefits, accident and sickness insurance, marriage benefits, loans for advanced education of teacher's children.

No visa for Korea?

At about the time we arrived in Japan, there was a flareup in Japanese-Korean relations. It appears that the Japanese Government issued visas to three technicians from North Korea so that they could help install some new machinery in a Japanese factory. The Republic of Korea held that this was an infringement of the treaty between it and Japan and announced that it would grant no more visas to Japanese.

It seemed to me that if the Japanese teachers were barred from Korea, we might have serious trouble in Seoul. I requested that JTU cancel our three-day trip to Kyushu and the Inland Sea so that I might give full attention to working at the Korean Embassy in Tokyo and elsewhere for the issuance of the visas.

I twice telephoned Seoul about this matter and we exchanged telegrams as well. The Korean Federation of Education Associations, our host organization in Seoul, understood from the Foreign Minister that the visa ban would not apply to delegates to WCOTP. The Korean Government regarded itself in a limited sense as sponsor of the meeting and the visas would be regarded as official, since the government had shared in inviting and hosting the WCOTP.

However, the occasional Japanese applicants for a visa, whom I caused to go by the Korean Embassy at intervals, reported that the visa officer continued to deny Japanese nationals a Korean visa for any purpose. Japanese delegates who had applied as long as two weeks before continued to get the same answer.

On Monday, July 25, I decided, even without help or introductions from anybody, to call on the Korean Ambassador. I suggested to Ambassador Kim that to stop the visas for our delegates was a retroactive measure since the Japanses delegates had applied for their visas before the announcement of the ban by the Korean Government. I stressed the importance to Korea of the conference and the desirability of avoiding debate which would certainly arise in Seoul if we had no Japanese delegates present when our member organizations in Japan were only two hours' flight away from the conference city. I was not asking him to set aside the regulations for the future, but only to go through with commitments already made. The Ambassador heard me out with great courtesy and he said he would do his best to help.

In the end, the Embassy received the "go-ahead" from Seoul, and everybody who really wanted to go to Korea got a visa. All of the WCOTP delegates from the Japan Teachers Union, the Japan Education Association, and the Shinano Education Association turned up at Seoul. There were around 90 Japanese in attendance, including translators and WCOTP staff.

So, on July 29 we concluded our visit to Tokyo, but we still have not seen Kyushu and the Inland Sea.

Korean recovery and hospitality

The WCOTP Assembly in Seoul was an immense success. The theme was "Educational Planning." The enthusiasm of the Korean teachers was high. We constituted the first large and important international meeting to be held in Korea and the city was adorned with welcoming arches, especially along the road in from the airport. The "Citizen's Hall," where we held our formal opening session and were greeted personally by President Park, was packed. At the regular sessions of the Assembly at Walkers Hill, Korean visitors and observers were so numerous that a rotation system had to be established so that all the Koreans who came could at least glimpse a WCOTP session.

I was particularly gratified to notice the recovery of the educational system of the Republic. When I first visited Korea in 1953, as part of the Mission of the American-Korean Federation, headed by General Van Fleet, the schools of the nation were in ruins, the scarred remnants of advancing and retreating armies, books burned in piles. Scarcely a school had any equipment. Casualty rates among teachers had been high. I remembered at that time visiting a school in Seoul where all the musical instruments had been placed in a single room in the hope that they might escape damage. The invading army had broken into that schoolroom and driven a pickax through the center of the keyboard of each of the 12 pianos. The children of Korea had in many cases attended school out of doors, in choking dust during the summer, without shelter or warmth in the winter cold and the torrential rains. Under these almost impossible conditions I saw teachers and students pressing forward in the task of teaching and learning as though the life of the Republic depended on their efforts, as in fact, in a very profound sense, it did.

During my second visit in 1956 things were beginning to look up, and now in 1966, one could see what had been accomplished. There was a good supply of attractively printed textbooks. We heard a magnificent student orchestra at the opening session. Schools and colleges were flourishing. This almost incredible recovery was due to two basic factors: First, a government which really believes, as President Park told us, that "education is the key to the future." Second, one of the finest teachers' organizations in the would, with devoted elected officials and a capable staff led for years by my honored friend, Tai Si Chung.

But beyond the mechanics of providing a place to meet, escorts through the streets, and arches and banners of welcome, were the innumerable examples of affection and goodwill which every delegate felt even during his first few hours in Seoul. Our Vice-President, Mr. Natarajan, made a quotable statement to President Park. Mr. Natarajan said, in substance, that we travelled thousands of miles to reach this place from all parts of the world and yet we found ourselves still at home—so surrounded were we by the care and consideration of our hosts.

I may add here that I visited Korea for the fourth, and probably final time, in 1971. The recovery of the school system was continuing briskly at that time. Colonized and exploited by the Japanese for a third of a century, divided from most of its industrially valuable raw materials by compromises imposed upon it by great power politics, subjected to a brutal invasion and a viciously destructive war, the Republic of Korea has remained invulnerable alike to external aggression and domestic misrule because of the spirit of its people.

I consider the award to me by the Republic of Korea of the Medal of the Order of Cultural Merit one of the greatest honors that has come to me.

WCOTP added several more members during the Seoul meeting but by far the most importnat new member was the Indonesian Teachers Federation with 257,000 individual members. Our years of effort to keep open our lines of communication to the Indonesian teachers had borne fruit at last. The transfer of power from the pro-communist Sukarno to a nationalist government occurred in March 1966 and the Indonesian teachers lost no time in taking up membership in WCOTP at the very next opportunity. Theirs is, I believe, the sixth largest national teachers' organization in the world, surpassed only by those of the USSR, the People's Democratic Republic of China, the United States, Japan, and India.

UNESCO literacy committee

Between the meetings of the WCOTP Assembly in Seoul in 1966 and in Vancouver in 1967, Director-General Maheu of UNESCO named me as one of the 20 members of the International Consultative Liaison Committee for Literacy.

The first meeting of the Committee for Literacy was held in Paris in June, 1967. Two other meetings in Paris were held at approximately two-year intervals. The Fourth meeting of the Committee which will probably turn out to be its last was held in December 1973 in Teheran.

Through membership on this Committee and activities related to it, I have learned several things about illiteracy as a world problem.

First, it seems clear that literacy does not contribute to international peace. Illiterate people can wage only minor fourth-rate wars which do not kill or injure very many people. Only the nations and regions with high levels of literacy–Europe, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, and North America–can wage war on a large scale. The ability to read has nothing to do with international goodwill or understanding. Nevertheless, literacy is now a necessity for national and human growth and development. It should be as widely developed as possible among all peoples but not with the the mistaken hope that it will prevent major wars or even make them less likely.

Second, illiteracy is increasing. After years of literacy campaigns of every kind and after vast expenditures of time and money, the number of adult illiterates in the world increased by about one hundred million in the years when the UNESCO Committee was most active. The number of literates has increased, the percentage of adults who are literate has increased, but the number of illiterates has also increased. The reason, of course, is that the birth rates in the developing countries increase the number of children needing education far more rapidly than schools can be built or teachers can be prepared. The world literacy program is like pouring water in a barrel full of holes.

Third, it appears that illiteracy can be quickly reduced or eliminated in a developing country only if the methods used are unconventional and inventive. Furthermore the skills associated with literacy require some practice to retain their effectiveness.

Fourth, in a country with widespread illiteracy a strong motivation must be provided for this learning. However much we might wish that things were otherwise, economic motivation is the most generally effective stimulus. If illiterate persons are told that learning to read and write will enable them to get better jobs, earn more pay, and enjoy a higher standard of living the motivation is highest.

A further motivation may be provided if it can be said that literacy will help you and your family to have less sickness.

Some people in some cultures may be attracted by a religious motivation: learn to read your Bible, your Koran, your Holy Scriptures.

Least effective in the list of motivations is the one to which idealists most readily resort—learn to read in order that you can attain your full human dignity, share in the history and cultural life of your country. Cultural, religious, health, and economic advancement will each motivate some people to some degree under some circumstances but by far the greatest of these is economic.

Fifth, a literacy program has its best chance of success if it is closely related to the other aspects of education. Universal primary education which provides the skills of literacy to all children would, in a few years, rapidly reduce and ultimately eliminate adult illiteracy.

The Iranian program

While on the subject of illiteracy, and before turning attention to the 1967 WCOTP Delegate Assembly, I should mention the invitation which my wife and I accepted in 1969 to make a first hand study and report on the two major Iranian Government literacy programs: the "Army of Knowledge" and the "National Committee on Literacy." The first of these programs operates mainly in the 50,000 very small villages where about three-fourths of the population of Iran lives. The word "Army" as used to describe this program is not to be taken in a figurative sense. In Iran every able-bodied young man is required to serve a term in the military forces. When we were there some 30,000 of these young men, having completed a few months of basic military training were serving the rest of their military obligation as teachers in the villages. The number of soldiers assigned to this duty was increasing rapidly. In addition, some 2,000 young women were serving voluntarily in the Army of Knowledge.

The National Literacy Committee functions mainly in the cities of Iran. The Princess Ashraf, twin sister to the Shah of Iran, presided over the UNESCO Literacy Committee and was in direct charge of the National Literacy Committee. Other than a few administrative personnel, the National Literacy Committee has no full-time employees. The 23,000 men and women who were teaching adults to read and write followed a variety of other full-time occupations. They were performing this extra work partly to earn a small supplement to their regular income but chiefly to render a highly esteemed public service.

I shall not attempt here to describe or even to summarize all we saw and heard in sixteen very full days in Iran. Our report on the two programs was published in English, French, and Arabic by the Iran Teachers Association which had, with the encouragement of the Princess, arranged for our invitation. Much of that report is now out-of-date. It should be completely revised and reissued. Nowhere in the world, in my opinion, could one find, at that time, educational programs more inventive and creative than the two programs we studied in Iran.

VANCOUVER, 1967

The Vancouver meetng of the WCOTP Assembly of Delegates was well planned and greatly assisted by the Canadian Teachers Federation which had levied a special assessment on its members for hospitality to WCOTP. Vancouver provided an ideal setting for the Assembly. It is a city marked by vigorous cultural activity, adorned with parks of unusual beauty, and blessed with a first class hotel where all delegates, all meal functions, and every meeting from that of the Assembly to that of the smallest subcommittee could be conveniently housed.

Attendance was excellent. Delegations were present from 76 national member organizations. The NEA participants consisted of 46 delegates and 60 observers, the Canadian Teachers Federation sent 31 delegates and 86 observers. Other countries from which more participants than usual appeared included the Philippines, Korea, England, Japan, France, Sweden and Chile. The regional organization of the Latin American teachers' organizations held its triennial Assembly in Mexico about a week before the WCOTP met in Vancouver. By arranging for a chartered bus between Mexico and Vancouver and for along-the-way hospitality from teachers' organizations in California, Oregon, and Washington we had an unusually good representation from South and Central America.

The Assembly theme for 1967 was "The Professional Responsibilities of Teachers Organizations." It was good to hear the representatives of teachers throughout the world speak of the acceptance of duties as well as the claiming of rights. The working committees and discussion groups dealt with responsibilities of teachers' organizations to their own members, to society as a whole, and to international cooperation.

Fiscal problems

The Vancouver Assembly gave more than the usual amount of attention to the financing of the Confederation. When WCOTP was founded, its income was derived from membership dues, supplemented shortly thereafter by a subvention from UNESCO. As the membership expanded to meet the varying needs of the members and to create a world-wide, year-round operation, with essential language services and comprehensive representation at Assemblies, the program was extended considerably.

However, the increase in the number of national members was not accompanied by a comparable increase in funds. Many of the new member associations were small and they faced serious difficulties which gave them little or no margin to spend on international activities.

Thus when WCOTP decided to expand its program it decided to seek external contributions. The Executive Committee authorized this step at the Manila meeting in 1956. The Committee voted that all monies received should be under the full control of WCOTP, and expended only on the program as determined by the Assembly of Delegates. Every year financial reports were represented to the Executive Committee and in turn to the Assembly of Delegates. The conditions laid down by the Executive Committee had always been closely observed.

The imbalance between external funds and membership income concerned the Executive Committee on several occasions. This condition was reported to the 1965 Assembly in Addis Ababa and a year later the Assembly agreed to a second increase in membership dues.

The fact that a large proportion of the external funds came from one country, the United States, had also been pointed out. On a number of occasions I urged member organizations throughout the world to suggest sources, in their respective countries, to assist the overall operations of WCOTP. But in this little success was achieved.

In February 1967, reports appeared in some United States newspapers which claimed that certain foundations were receiving funds from the Central Intelligence Agency, and that these funds were given to a number of national and international organizations. One of these foundations was said to have made grants to WCOTP.

When the press reports appeared, I wrote to member organizations, stating that if the press reports were true, WCOTP was unaware of the ultimate source of the grants. I also informed the Executive Committee that I would not again request or accept such assistance until the position was clear.

I tried, without notable success, to raise funds from other sources, both to replace the lost income and to diversify WCOTP's external sources of assistance. I introduced a number of economies to spread the funds in hand over the longest possible period. I also presented to the Executive Committee proposals aimed at eventually covering WCOTP's basic expenses from membership dues.

The Executive Committee during the Vancouver meeting voted to approve the actions I had taken.

The Committee also agreed:

a) that all funds previously received by WCOTP had been given without restrictions and used solely for activities approved by the Assembly of Delegates year by year;

241

b) that proposals should be presented to the 1968 Assembly to increase the membership dues as soon as practicable and in particular to bring forward from 1970 to 1969 the increase in dues to 20 Swiss centimes per member, as voted in 1968 by the Seoul Assembly;

c) that since even these dues provide insufficient income, the Executive Committee should examine, in consultation with the national members and the constituent federations, various plans to augment subscription income, and circulate the proposals to all member organizations six months prior to the 1968 Assembly;

d) that all member organizations be again urged to cooperate in suggesting possible sources of aid from their respective countries.

A report on the above developments and recommendations was placed before the Delegate Assembly during its first day of meeting and was promptly approved.

Individual problems

With all the delegates and meetings close together, I was able in Vancouver to see even more individual delegates and delegations than was possible in some other more difficult meetings. For example, I saw Mr. Natarajan (India) about help to persuade the Ford Foundation to give him a grant for an Asian Regional Conference on the Teaching of English. I saw Mr. Miyanohara (Japan) about the recommendations of the WCOTP Asian Committee. I saw Mr. Levin (Israel) about his complaint that a campaign of anti-Semitic instruction was being developed in Egyptian schools. I saw Mr. Cunha (Brazil) who wanted me to know that he had translated into Portuguese and distributed 4,000 copies of my short speech introducing the 1967 WCOTP theme as delivered in Seoul a year before. I saw the Secretary of the Canadian Teachers Federation, Gerald Nason, who was about to initiate in Washington a four-week study for the Canadian Foreign Office on teaching about Canada in the schools of the United States.

I saw Mrs. de Paulino (Dominican Republic) about a familiar subject. Their teachers' organization was in arrears for the rent of their office and the salary of their clerk. They had nothing left from earlier income. They could not collect dues from members because of hostility of the Minister of Education. Meanwhile they couldn't function until they had a national meeting. They hadn't any funds for a national meeting. They needed, for this purpose and to pay their debts, a sum of at least $1,000. I do not remember how we dealt with this problem. I do remember that Secretary of State Seward was denied by the United States Senate a few thousand dollars to buy the entire Dominican Republic the year after he acquired from the Russians for $72 million, the State of Alaska, then widely derided as "Seward's Folly."

I have given the above examples from the Vancouver Assembly, not because they were unusual, but rather as an illustration of the kinds of questions, great and small, which were my concern during any WCOTP annual Assembly of Delegates.

DUBLIN, 1968

The United Nations declared that 1968, the 20th Anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, should be known as Human Rights Year. It was natural and proper that the 1968 WCOTP Assembly in Dublin should be devoted to the same topic. The national member organizations prepared reports during 1967-68 about education in human rights and education itself as a basic right for all humanity.

The Irish National Teachers Organizaiton, which I visited in 1967 to make advance preparations, had arranged for the full cooperation of the Republic of Ireland Government and of the teachers' organizations in Ulster. Thus the Assembly was neither marked nor marred by any of the Irish versus English, Catholic versus Protestant hostilities which have been a prolonged source of grief to the present residents of Northern Ireland.

Reflections in San Francisco

Not long before the Dublin Conference, I happened to be briefly in San Francisco. In a retrospective mood, I wandered to the Fairmont Hotel and looked for the "Garden Room," so called, I suppose, because it was a bright room furnished with cane chairs and potted palms. In that room, more than twenty years before, I had met with the other United States Delegation advisers as part of the Conference that was drafting the United Nations Charter. I found the "Garden Room" in which we had met daily for about six weeks, but it had been converted to a storeroom piled high with unused furniture. As I turned to leave, somewhat disappointed, my eye was caught by a bronze plaque on the far wall. Because of the stored furniture I could not move close to the plaque but I was able, in the poor light, to make out the substance of the inscription. It ran something like this: In this Room in April 1945 the Consultants of the United States Delegation to the United Nations Constitutional Conference met to formulate the first plans for a Declaration of Rights of Mankind.

I thought, as I walked away, of all the other important questions we had earnestly considered in that Garden Room,–whether, for instance, there should be a veto in the Security Council, whether the Charter should provide for international cooperation in education, whether the UN Headquarters should be in San Francisco or Geneva, whether the UN should launch a program to provide self-government to colonial people. I confess that I was pleased that someone thought that the preliminary steps toward a Universal Declaration of Human Rights should be marked in enduring bronze in a world where elegant hotel parlors become dingy storerooms and yesterday's allies become today's opponents.

It was about three-and-a-half years after our San Francisco Conference before the text of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights could be completed and adopted. Since then there can be no reasonable doubt that, although man's inhumanity to man still makes countless thousands mourn, much spectacular progress toward Human Rights has been achieved. Complacency is certainly the enemy of action. But undue preoccupation with our shortcomings, numerous as they may be, can also paralyze effort.

Universal Declaration

The Universal Delcaration of Human Rights, whose 20th Anniversary WCOTP observed in Dublin in 1968, was a statement of hope and purpose. It has become, to an increasing extent, a statement of achievement. To make that achievement more perfect and permanent is a responsibility not only for teachers but also for the rest of humankind.

It is not necessary to be a world traveller to contribute to the ideals set forth in the Universal Declaration. Eleanor Roosevelt, who did much to make the Declaration a reality, once observed that universal human rights begin in small places *close to home*–so small that they cannot be seen on any map of the world. The neighborhood, the school, the home, the factory, farm, or office are the places where humanity first seeks, and should first find, equal justice, opportunity, and dignity. If these rights are not found *close to home,* we shall seek them in vain in remote places.

The schoolroom is *close to home.* Teaching Human Rights there is a task that, like most other educational purposes, can never be finished but must always be commenced. If teachers begin with young people they lay the basis, *close to home,* for future achievement in the larger world of nations and of international conferences.

The Declaration requires teachers to develop "respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms." The Declaration does not say that we should merely teach and learn respect for our own rights and freedoms. The more difficult task is to teach and learn respect for the rights and freedoms *of others.*

The responsibilities of education in this are not easy. After all, some of the rights proclaimed in the Universal Declaration are revolutionary to some societies, counter-revolutionary to others. Some of the enumerated rights are detested by some societies and distrusted by others. Education may properly be expected to preserve the culture and traditions of a society. But if education ignores the need for change it will remove the vitality from the very culture it seeks to preserve. Education must guide and develop in the present as well as honor and preserve the past.

Further financial discussions

Aside from the Conference theme, the attention of the Delegate Assembly was concentrated on the growing problems of financing the Confederation. The Finance Committee proposed that the increase in dues already scheduled for 1970 be made effective in 1969 instead. An amendment was proposed to postpone decision on this point for a year.

I spoke strongly against all delaying amendments. The Assembly had already deplored the low salaries of the paid members of the staff. I fully agreed with this assessment and added that uncertainty about the future is even more detrimental to staff morale than inadequate salaries. The Vancouver Assembly had voted unanimously to finance the basic WCOTP program from membership dues. If, after a year's time, with frequent reminders in the interval, the delegates at Dublin were to take still another year to think it over, the results might be most unfortunate. Being unpaid myself, I was able to speak quite frankly on this issue.

The delaying amendment was defeated, having only the votes of its sponsor, the Japan Teachers Union, the Yugoslav teachers delegation, and a few scattered members of smaller delegations.

I informed the Executive Committee at Dublin that I intended to resign as Secretary-General after the 1970 meeting and Sir Ronald Gould, accepting at Dublin his ninth re-election as President, told the Assembly that he would under no circumstances be a candidate for re-election at the conclusion of his two-year term in 1970.

Of the hospitality of the Irish people, and especially of the Irish teachers it is impossible to speak too highly. We were addressed by the Prime Minister and all the appropriate lesser officials. We met the venerable Eamon de Valera in his official residence. The Abbey Players did a Yeats play for us. And a chorus of well-scrubbed, red-headed, blue-eyed angels sang for us about "Dublin's Fair City" and much other music. I tried to sum it up by a few words at the Farewell Banquet:

> We are not the first of our profession to find the way to Ireland from the far corners of the world. Twelve hundred years ago, teachers from distant lands came by the thousands to receive from Irish teachers their wisdom and inspiration. When the grandeur of the Roman Forum had become a second-hand marble quarry and the lamps of civilized learning were flickering low all over Europe, teachers in Ireland guarded the flame. In this last, westernmost bit of Europe, teaching and learning were prized when elsewhere education was unknown and unhonored.
>
> When Charles the Great ruled most of Europe, he was an illiterate (I speak, of course, of an earlier Charles than the one we know of today). That earlier Charles the Great, whom we today call Charlemagne, could not write his own name but when he resolved to have the children of his court taught to read and write, he sent for teachers from Ireland to rescue his country from the darkness of illiteracy.
>
> From this little island has come a steady stream of emigrants who have made life better for the rest of the world. For what she was in the past, is today, and may

become in the future, Ireland owes much to her teachers. And so do we all.

I propose this toast: The Teachers of Ireland!

ABIDJAN, 1969

Between the Dublin and Abidjan meetings, I made two short trips abroad and one fairly extensive journey. The first short trip was to Mexico City where I gave the concluding summary for a three-day pre-Olympic international conference on sports and education. A second short trip took me to Paris in September for a five-day meeting of the UNESCO Literacy Committee, a one-day visit to the WCOTP member in Senegal, and four days in Abidjan to make the preliminary arrangements for the 1969 Delegate Assembly. These were interesting and useful meetings but essentially routine.

Manila

The longer trip extended from April 18 to June 7. It began with a 24-hour rest-stop in Manila where I met officers of the Philippine Public School Teachers Association, visited their new office building, and completed arrangements for some outside expert participation in the big (4,000 teachers) inservice training program in Baguio for the coming summer.

Djakarta

I moved on to Indonesia and the Fourth WCOTP Asian Regional Conference on the role of teachers' organizations in educational development.

The meetings were conducted in Djakarta, at the research and experimental education centers in Bandung, and at two small villages. A report was prepared for publication and distribution. Papers on the conference topic were presented by Malcolm Adiseshiah, Deputy Director-General of UNESCO, and by me. Among the Indonesian teachers I found a general appreciation of the efforts of General Suharto and his government to improve education. Their attitude was far more favorable than it had been during my previous visit when President Sukarno had been running the country. Nevertheless, the teachers were finding that progress in education was much more difficult than they had hoped for immediately after the coup d' etat.

Madras

From Djakarta I flew to Madras where my chief concern was to visit the WCOTP three-year project on education for national and international understanding. This project, for which I had secured a grant from the Longwood Foundation, was attempting to assist teachers in Madras State to understand the people and cultures of other parts of India and to gain some insight into the activities of the United Nations and other international bodies.

A seminar was being held for about 120 teachers and principals from the schools participating in the WCOTP project. The project was the brainchild of Shri Natarajan, Vice President of WCOTP, and was administered by the South India Teachers Union.

The Seminar was held in the best place that could be obtained free. It was steaming hot and clamorous with the din of nearby main-street traffic. These physical difficulties, I was told, did not trouble the attending teachers because the schools in which many of them worked were much worse.

Here are a few points brought out by speakers and participants in the discussion:

In a certain teachers' college a room called the "Spiritual Center" is set aside for understanding other religious views.

Another teachers' college has developed an exhibit, changed by a different class each month, to display products and symbols of different countries.

Camping was discussed as an inter-state or international activity. Under the Junior Red Cross, study centers have been organized in some camping sites in India. This has been followed by Indian participation in international youth camps. However, these activities have been reduced because of continuing expense. The initial dynamism in this area faded. Camping continues on a limited routine basis.

Reports from the five working committees were written and duplicated, formally presented and seriously discussed.

The Committee on History asked how Indian schools should deal with the then recent dispute with Pakistan.

The geography report stressed interdependence and subcommittees dealt with regions, land forms, and resources.

The Mathematics and Science Committees agreed that the international adoption of the metric system and the international contribution of science to human welfare should be stressed.

The Committee on Languages recommended instruction in the vernacular plus one other Indian regional language, plus Sanskrit, plus English. This formidable goal was not challenged. All agreed that the mother tongue should be taught first.

Mr. Natarajan, speaking after the chairman as a kind of summary, said that during the coming year the officers would visit every praticipating school and teacher. He said that the project would expect further aid from the Madras government.

All in all, I was pleased with the spirit and ingenuity with which very serious difficulties had been met by the project. At the same time, I was vividly reminded of the terrible handicap imposed on educational change in India by grinding poverty and continued difficulties created by language barriers.

The Seminar ended happily with a special session called a "Felicitation Meeting" for Shri Natarajan who had recently received the Padma Shri Award from the President of India.

While in Madras, I got in touch with the CARE mission there. It has been my custom to do this wherever possible. As a public member of the Board of CARE I often found it informative and useful to observe its work abroad. The account of my CARE contacts in Madras may serve as typical of many such contacts in other places.

CARE has been operating a school lunch service in Madras since 1955. The 1968-69 droughts created near-famine in Madras State and the CARE program had been greatly expanded. The number of beneficiaries rose to 1.6 million and the number of schools involved to 28,000. Half the food is provided by CARE; the other half is provided by the Madras government. Expense of delivering the food and the administration costs are paid by Madras State, and the Panchayat Unions (townships), and the local people, in cash or kind or labor. The Madras Director of Education told me that the program has improved attendance and alertness in class.

The first of several central kitchens to prepare the food was in operation at Poonamallee. This establishment was in excellent condition and full production. Storage for food, with protection against vermin, insects, and thieves, was provided. Food was cooked electrically in stainless drums. The cooked food was delivered by truck in vessels marked with the number of the school and the number of children to be fed.

Only teachers in a few isolated schools without roads are required to prepare the food for their students. For such schools, CARE, AID, and the Madras government have built about 140 small kitchens.

The food includes mainly bulgar wheat and soybeans. To stand along the docks and to see the enormous quantities of CARE food lifted from the ship's hold, hour after hour, day and night, is an impressive sight.

I visited three schools in the Poonamallee area. Not all children receive CARE food. Some go home at mid-day, others bring their lunch from home. Eligibility to receive the food depends essentially on the economic status of the family.

CARE and the Madras government were also involved in: (1) building and equipment of two vans and trailers as mobile teaching laboratories for science instruction, and (2) special nutrition for 100,000 pre-school children and pregnant and nursing mothers.

Relations between the CARE staff and the local authorities appeared to be especially friendly and effective.

Iran: grandeur and glitter

After a short stop in Bombay to see other CARE personnel, I moved on to Teheran. My wife, who was to join me there for the rest of the journey, had arrived from Washington via Rome just a few minutes before my plane from Bombay arrived. We met happily in the customs hall.

I have described elsewhere the essentials of our observations in Iran with regard to the literacy program but I should add just a few words, perhaps, on the human interest side of the story. Iran is a beautiful and varied country ruled by an absolute and intelligent monarch deeply concerned for the welfare of his country. In the upper reaches of government no decision of any importance is taken without the knowledge and approval of the Shah.

The two major tourist sights in Teheran are the Gulistan Palace, a glittering and elegant show place used for formal receptions, and the magnificent Crown Jewels, the wealth on which the Bank of Iran is based. In Isfahan the two major sights are the ancient polo field surrounded by palaces and mosques of imposing grandeur and subtle charm and the modern Shah Abbas Hotel which must surely be one of the half dozen most beautiful caravanserais in the world.

Between Teheran and Cairo the best flights involved a change of plane in Beirut with a one-hour layover. I therefore wrote Mr. Baalbaki, the regional representative of WCOTP in that area, about these plans and suggested that if convenient I would be glad to chat with him in the Beirut airport transit lounge.

Kidnapped!

I had not properly assessed Mr. Baalbaki's resourcefulness. He met us at the airport, told us that we must stay at least two days in Beirut, and before I could repeat, "we don't even have visas for Lebanon," we were in a car headed for town, our luggage beside us, cleared through customs without a touch. We spent two restful and delightful days in Beirut under his competent and genial guidance.

While in Beirut I made contact with officials of the Lebanese Teachers Syndicate. The Syndicate is one of the smaller ones in the Arab countries. Its members are all in private schools; the public school teachers, far more numerous, are not permitted to belong to a syndicate. Nevertheless, the public schools were all closed by a teachers' strike, syndicate or no syndicate. The issues had just been settled and the strike would end with the reopening of schools in a day or two. The Syndicate of private school teachers had organized the strike on the theory that whatever added benefits were secured for those in the public schools would certainly be shortly provided for private school teachers as well.

Cairo

When we reached Cairo we were received with the same cordiality as on previous occasions. However, it was soon clear that the outlook for continued WCOTP affiliation with Arab teachers in general, and Egyptian teachers in particular, was deteriorating. The Syndicate leaders were often invited on goodwill missions to Russia and Eastern Europe. Hospitality on these occasions was described as lavish. A special meeting of the leaders of the Federation of Arab Teacher Syndicates (FATS) had been convened in Prague. There the delegates from Syria and the Sudan had proposed that the FATS members all withdraw from WCOTP and join

FISE. Their hosts in Prague had talked a good deal about the United States "favoritism" toward Israel, its "aggression" in Vietnam, and the rebuffs which FISE said it encountered when it sought to cooperate with WCOTP.

The FATS group was divided on this proposal, Egypt and Iraq insisting on maintaining relations with WCOTP. It was finally proposed as a compromise that FATS members could affiliate to either FISE or WCOTP or to both. The FISE delegation, however, did not at first agree to this formula. Subsequently, after a few of the more powerful FATS leaders had met in Moscow, it was agreed that all the Arab Syndicates would join FISE and those who wished to do so might affiliate also to WCOTP. The payment of dues for FISE affiliation was never mentioned.

One of the participants in these discussions told me that during the Prague conference he had casually visited the FISE office in Prague, asked a clerk for a copy of the current FISE budget, and received it. This document, he said, showed an income from all sources of 7000 pounds. Yet he knew that FISE must have spent at least 90,000 pounds on Middle East relationships alone. He then asked a leading FISE official to account for this discrepancy. No rational explanation was attempted; however, the official was annnoyed that the FISE budget could be obtained so easily.

I had extended conversations with the officials of the Teachers Syndicate and of FATS. Their difficulties in remaining within WCOTP became increasingly clear.

We discussed the FATS seminar to be held in Alexandria in August. The theme would be "New Trends in the Teaching of Mathematics." In general, the Seminar would be like the one on science teaching which I had attended in 1965. They expected a strong delegation from the U.S.S.R. and FISE and were very eager that I should attend. They also asked me to arrange for other high-level representation from the United States.

Mr. Ennarah proposed that Alexandria be the site of serious discussions of cooperation between WCOTP and FISE. I believe he saw the Arabs acting as the intermediary in arranging and conducting these discussions. As time passed, however, this role and the proposed meeting, were scaled down to an informal lunch to which the UAR Syndicate would invite some FISE and WCOTP delegates in Alexandria. I pointed out that the WCOTP Executive had some years ago created a Liaison Committee which had met with FISE on three occasions with little success. I said that many

Executive members were increasingly doubtful about cooperation with FISE because of the recent occupation of Czechoslovakia.

My wife became very ill in Cairo, experienced traveller though she is. The Egyptians could not have been more concered and helpful. They sent her an excellent doctor from the staff of the Teachers Syndicate Hospital and she recovered enough to move on to Tunisia only one day late.

Tunis

When we reached Tunis it took the better part of a day to get in touch with the office of the Tunisia Teachers Syndicate. When I did find them they were most cordial. They took me to call on the appropriate officials at the Ministry of Education and entertained us at an excellent dinner where my wife secured the recipe and manner of cooking Tunisian *couscous.*

While waiting for our Tunisian teacher friends to be located, we dropped into the CARE mission. This American relief agency was at that time providing about 190,000 school children and about 4,500 pre-school children with a hot mid-day meal. We saw this program in action in two schools near Carthage. The physical facilities were poor and the regimentation and crowding of the children (Get in line! Take the bowl with your right hand!) reminded me of the opening scenes in *Oliver*! The children didn't seem to mind. The CARE mission chief told us that his greatest difficulty is to persuade the Tunisian officials to make advance plans rather than last-minute improvisations which are often wasteful and inefficient. This is a common problem for CARE operations in most parts of the world.

Edinburgh

After brief stops in Barcelona and London, we ended this overseas expedition in the city of Edinburgh where I was made an Honorary Fellow of the Educational Institute of Scotland. This was the first such recognition to an American in 22 years. It is an unusually elegant Diploma and I give below an edited text:

THE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTE OF SCOTLAND
Incorporated by Royal Charter, 1851

The Fellows of the Educational Institute of Scotland, at their Statutory Meeting held in Edinburgh on the 4th day of June 1969, Having duly considered the recommendation of the Council of the Institute in favour of

WILLIAM G. CARR, A.B., A.M., Ph.D., (Hons) L.H.D., L.L.D.

did elect him a FELLOW OF THE INSTITUTE and the Stated Annual General Meeting did on the same day approve and sanction the said election and resolved to grant this Diploma conferring upon him the Grade of FELLOW OF THE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTE OF SCOTLAND, he having rendered signal service to the cause of education throughout the world.

As Executive Secretary of the National Education Association, his wisdom and energy have made a lasting impact on the schools and on the teaching profession in the United States of America.

As Secretary General of the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession he has laboured assiduously and accomplished much for the benefit of children and teachers everywhere.

As author, visiting professor and educational consultant, he has shared his wisdom and vision with others; and his administrative genius has played a major part in the creation of new but necessary agencies and in consolidating and increasing the effectiveness of existing organizations.

James Carmichael, M.A., F.E.I.S.
President

I took great pleasure in thanking the Institute, at the public meeting for this ceremony, by recalling the unique services of the Institute to WOTP and WCOTP, especially in the critical first live-or-die years of the world organization. I mentioned particularly the former President of the Institute, Miss Margaret Pringle, who had graciously come a long distance from her home in retirement to attend this ceremony of investiture.

Abidjan attendance

The Abidjan, Ivory Coast, Delegate Assembly, our second in Africa, had for its theme, "The Role of Teachers' Organizations in Assistance to Developing Countries."

Attendance at Abidjan was higher than expected but only because of extensive participation from nearby African countries (Ivory Coast, Liberia, Ghana). Without subsidization, participation from more remote parts of Africa was negligible. For small countries in East Africa, such as Zambia, Malagasy, or Somalia the conference was no more accessible than if it had been on the moon. The Confederation was compelled by its diminished financial resources to discontinue travel subsidies to small member organizations.

Nigerians all sent regrets; their government, irked by Ivorian recognition of Biafra, would not allow them to attend. Visa applications of other delegates to visit Nigeria in connection with the Abidjan meeting received such a chilly response that many such visits were cancelled.

Attendance from Latin America was down to eight, the lowest for a WCOTP conference since 1956. Attendance from the United States and Canada was normal. Jamaica, Trinidad, and Guyana were also represented.

Asian representation was small, except for Japan and the Philippines. Indonesia, Pakistan, Malaya were all absent. Iraq did not appear; their delegate, we were told, stopped en route in East Germany for medical treatment and was unable to continue the trip. Israel and Lebanon were both absent. Iran and Thailand attended. So did Australia and New Zealand.

Most of the European members were present. Their delegations were small as usual, no matter where the Assembly is held.

A WCOTP Seminar on Cooperatives for French-speaking teachers was held just before the Delegate Assembly. It was very successful. The experts sent from ILO had the knowledge and the organizing skill, and they provided enough money to make it succeed.

Sydney meeting plans

When the Australian invitation to WCOTP to meet in Sydney in 1970 was submitted by Mr. Whalen in 1968 it was accompanied by a suggestion, but not a condition, that WCOTP also invite FISE to send a delegation. Mr. Whalen brought up this matter at the first meeting of the Executive; it was discussed, the difficulties were pointed out, but no definite action was taken.

Mr. Whalen, however, said he was instructed by his delegation to press for a decision and he again brought up the point at the meeting of the New Executive Committee on August 6. Most of the Executive did not know, or had forgotten, that the WCOTP Liaison Committee had met with FISE representatives in 1958, 1959, and 1964. One of the agreements reached on those occasions was an exchange of publications and an exchange of observers at meetings. I recounted the lack of cooperation that WCOTP had received from FISE with regard to such exchanges.

The President then said that there were three choices:

(1) to invite FISE to Sydney if WCOTP is invited to a comparable FISE meeting

(2) to correspond with FISE in order to get background material to consider this question in Sydney

(3) to leave the matter without further action

Mr. Whalen moved Option No. 1, above. The motion was lost for want of a second. With only one negative vote (Mr. Whalen), Option No. 3 was adopted.

Accra: visual aids

A Seminar on Audio-Visual Education had been arranged by WCOTP to be held in Accra, the capital of Ghana, immediately after the adjournment of the Assembly at Abidjan. The physical arrangements were in the hands of the Ghana National Association of Teachers (GNAT) while the program was the responsibility of Dr. Anna Hyer, Chairperson of the WCOTP Committee on Audio-Visual Education.

The use of cinema, radio, and television for instruction is in such a primitive form in West Africa that any ideas and information about it are almost sure to create interest.

On the negative side, GNAT, the host organization, was assigned and accepted far more responsibility than it was really prepared to handle. On many occasions there was no representative of GNAT on hand for hours at a stretch. Mr Caulley, the parttime WCOTP representative in Ghana, was not feeling well. The program was constantly changed, without notice and without any apparent reason.

For the West Africans the Seminar was an immense success; for the sophisticated handful of United States and United Kingdom delegates, it had little to offer. The expert consultant supplied by UNESCO was extremely helpful.

Alexandria revisited

As mentioned earlier I had promised, if possible, to attend the Alexandria meeting of FATS which had been timed to follow the WCOTP activities on the African west coast. I also had arranged a display of sample mathematics testbooks and workbooks from the United States.

I had been asked also to secure an outstanding American scholar to address the Alexandria conference on current trends in the teaching of mathematics. I turned first to the President of the California Institue of Technology, Dr. Lee Dubridge, who was then serving in the White House as President Johnson's Adviser on Science and Technology. Although Dr. Dubridge was unable to go to Alexandria himself, he did in his usual helpful manner offer an excellent suggestion. He proposed his able Deputy, Dr. Hubert Heffner (later Chairman of the Department of Applied Physics at Stanford University).

Inaugural session

Heads of Arab delegations were on the platform. The Minister of Education, UAR, said the primary purpose of all Arab efforts is to halt the Israeli occupation of Arab lands. He welcomed the participants from the Arab teachers' organizations, from WCOTP, from the Soviet Union, from the United States, and other countries. He and other speakers usually referred to "the one Arab nation" within which the Arab countries are located. He made two references to Gamal Abdel Nasser, each of which elicited polite applause. He spoke of the new opportunities offered to humankind by the control of atomic energy and space exploration.

The Governor of Alexandria, and the president of the UAR Teachers Syndicate then welcomed the Conference.

Abdel Sattar El-Jawari, President of the Federation of Arab Teachers Syndicates (FATS), President of the Iraq Teachers Syndicate, and currently Iraq's Minister of Education, said that the "setback" (referring to the six-day war) was the result of a conspiracy to sabotage the progress of the Arab people.

A.A. Ennarah, Secretary-General of FATS again evoked scattered applause by reference to Nasser. The colonial powers support the crimes of Israel, he said, because they want, through Israel, to control Arabian oil.

Nasr-El-Din (Arab League) gave an account of the Arab League's cultural activities in an address remarkably free of polemics.

However, the next speaker (the chief Delegate from Sudan) more than made up for any previous elements of moderation. The Arabs are, he said, nearer to liberation now than at any time since the setback. We win great military successes every day (loud applause). We Arabs, united by history, language, and religion, defy the forces of Zionism and imperialism. The U.S.A. is closely linked to those forces.

The Syrian delegate followed. Like the Sudan delegate, he strongly criticized the United States by name. It seemed from the applause that this was what the Conference wanted to hear.

The Kuwait delegate spoke of a criminal conspiracy behind the genocidal activities of Israel. His call for full support to the Palestinian commandos evoked a new high in applause.

The Palestine spokesperson attacked UNRWA for plotting with the Imperialists against the Palestinian people and their Revolution.

The last of the Arab speakers was the representative of the "Teachers Association of the West Bank of the Jordan." Zionist aggression, he said, was an aspect of world imperialism. The masses of the people, in Vietnam, in Asia, in South America, were engaged in the same struggle.

The international teacher organizations were next. Since WCOTP was the only such represented, I was called up to speak. I received moderate applause, more than I expected, considering what had gone before.

Finally the delegate from the USSR teachers' union was called. She began with a complete endorsement of the Arab position vis-a-vis Israel. Soviet teachers, she said, are increasing efforts to make every child who completes his or her schooling a good communist. Before the great Russian revolution 80 percent of the children never attended school. Now all that is changed. She gave a rapid statistical review of the growing enrollments. Israel's aggression is abetted by reactionary imperialists in the USA. Many Arabs, she said, are working as supplementary teachers in the USSR, the 6-1/2 million members of our Union are supporting the Arab effort. The applause was tumultuous.

The meeting closed with a solo recital of some verses from the Koran. About half of the Arab speakers began their remarks by the ritual appeal to Allah.

Working Party No. 6

When the discussion groups met, I was given an interpreter and told that I was welcome to sample them. All were well attended and most of the discussion was the usual shop-talk of teachers about objectives, curriculum, and methods. There was, however, one exception–Group 6 on "National Achievements for Arab Teachers." When I slipped into the back of the room with the interpreter, a shouting match was going on, half of the men in the room were standing, and no one seemed to be listening to any one else. The President of the Federation had just arrived in response to an emergency call from the frantic chairperson. The issue was this: Dr. Heffner had brought with him a newly-edited seven-minute color film about the first moon-landing which had occurred about two weeks earlier, and was willing to have it shown.

The Conference officers had quickly accepted the possibility and announced it would be screened for conferees who wanted to see it during the noon break. Some of the younger hotheads demanded that the film not be shown. If it were shown they would boycott it and stage demonstrations. Their line seemed to be: "If the Americans can land on the moon they can make Israel leave us alone." The conclusion, however, was that the film could be shown "as a mark of respect for science." This decision was greatly assisted by a reminder that President Nasser had sent a congratulatory message on the moon landing. Meanwhile, Dr. Heffner had very sensibly gone with his Egyptian opposite number, the science adviser to President Nasser, to visit nearby scientific establishments.

Reception

At 4:30 that afternoon I gave a tea and fruit juice party for 40 people in honor of Dr. Heffner. I invited the head of each delegation and a few Egyptian friends with the hope that this would permit Dr. Heffner to make more personal contacts.

Plenary session

At 6 o'clock the moon-landing film was shown without incident. It was followed by a short film on the Palestine refugees.

The two films were about equally applauded. They were followed by what might be regarded as a progress report from

Committee 6, presented by a spokesperson from the Palestine group. The group was critical of the United Nations agencies responsible for the welfare of Arab refugees. It urged that the Minister of Education in a country where a refugee camp is located evaluate the educational system in the camps. The spiritual teachings of Islam were being neglected; to offset this danger the schools in refugee camps should be located next to the mosque (or church, if Christian Arabs were involved).

Dr. Heffner was next on the program. After an appreciative, friendly introduction by the FATS President, he delivered an excellent address on his assigned topic --the trends in mathematics teaching, ignoring the provocation that had been placed in his path. He spoke of (a) the "new" mathematics (b) teacher preparation and (c) computer-assisted instruction. His resolute adherence to the Conference theme, his avoidance of political issues, and the clarity and scope of his speech won him many friends. He was given considerably more applause when he finished than when he began.

He was followed by the Rector of Cairo University, Dr. Mohammed Morisi Ahmed, who spoke on the great Arab contributions to mathematics and science. However, these contributions were not generally recognized because of the Arab nature not to boast.

A Syrian delegate, called for more attention to Arab influence in science and mathematics. The Western world was making glorious strides in space. What place had the Arabs in all this? Arab lands were undeveloped because of colonial invasions. Down with agression, Zionism, imperialism, and war-mongers.

Evaluation

In the four-year interval between the Alexandria meeting on Science and the Alexandria meeting on Mathematics the ability of the Arab teachers to deal objectively with non-political, educational issues had deteriorated. In 1965 political issues were jammed into the inaugural session and not seriously considered thereafter. In 1969, were it not for the contact with WCOTP, the Conference would have become an all-out anti-American meeting. As it was, the forces of moderation were able to achieve some elements of balance. The fact that FISE refused (reportedly) to send a delegate to Cairo "if Carr is invited" also helped to prevent a field day for the Communists. Dr. Heffner was extremely valuable as a highly qualified United States speaker on the Conference theme—a speaker moreover who was touched with the unassailable glamor of the moon landing and the authority, however attenuated, of the White House.

I arrived home quite weary after almost a month on my "3-A trip" in Africa (Abidjan, Accra, Alexandria). It was then necessary quite soon to prepare for a meeting even further away from home,—the 1970 Delegate Assembly in Australia.

But before we move "down under" a couple of intermediate activities merit brief notice.

Island in the sun

Late in 1969 I was invited to address the Fiftieth Anniversary Congress of the Trinidad and Tobago Teachers Union. I was away only four days but even so short a time in Port-of-Spain is a pleasant reprieve from the Washington winter. A new wing of the Teachers Union Building was begun and its cornerstone dedicated with all solemnity. This was a substantial improvement on the tiny walk-up office in downtown Port-of-Spain where I had called in 1962.

I found a strong sense of emotional unity among teachers from the British-oriented Caribbean. No one knows how or when it will be brought about but, as late as 1969 at least, the search for political and economic unity in this area was still active in spite of the rather dismal failure in 1962. Delegates were present from Antigua, Barbados, Guyana. All of them reflected the feeling of strong ties to each other.

I was told on arrival that I was to stay in the Governor-General's house. I was the only guest to whom this courtesy was extended. Sir Solomon and Lady Hochoy were ideal hosts.

Republicanism was an issue frequently discussed. At the formal banquet the toast to "The Queen" was proposed in a rather off-hand manner. The teachers of Trinidad and Tobago, like the rest of the people of those islands, were by no means settled as to the advantages of remaining "within the golden circle of the Crown," as Winston Churchill put it.

Island in the mist

Late in March the National Union of Teachers of England and Wales invited me to attend its Centennial Conference in Eastboune. At the formal opening session of the Conference I was presented with an honorary life membership in the NUT—a very great distinction. There were only four other such members, the Speaker of the House of Commons (a former teacher) and three long-time officers of the NUT.

In my responsive remarks I attempted both a light and a serious touch. Here are a few sentences:

> When Winston Churchill was made an honorary citizen of the United States, he began his address of thanks to the U.S. Congress thus:
>
> > "Had my mother been British and my father an American, instead of the other way around, I might have got here on my own. In that case, this would not have been the first occasion on which you would have heard my voice. In that event, I should not have needed any invitation to speak but if I had, it is hardly likely that it would have been unanimous. So perhaps things are better as they are."
>
> Those are my sentiments, too. So I might say to you that if my parents had not decided to leave Northampton, the "shire of spires and squires," for an unknown future in North America, I might have achieved membership in the National Union of Teachers of England and Wales on my own, and in a more routine fashion than this. But they didn't and I didn't and so I thankfully receive this honorary membership, the first you have awarded outside of Britain.
>
> I hope you approved my use of the full name of our organization a moment ago. That "and Wales" was no accident on my part. As your newest member I am not planning at once to run for the Executive. Or to "stand" for it, as English-English usage insists. But just in case I am summoned to run, or stand, I see no harm in mentioning Wales. I owe much to English teachers for the unfailing support you have given to WCOTP, by far the strongest non-governmental agency of international scope. You have made substantial and continuing contributions to international teacher cooperation. In support-

> ing international efforts in education, we are not pursuing a fanciful dream. As surely as day follows night the time will come when every teacher will see to it that every child born in this world, receives an honest education free from xenophobic propaganda, and enjoys equal opportunity for a good education for the sufficient reason that a human being has a right to be educated. Finally, I am grateful to English teachers for producing and following the leadership of Sir Ronald Gould. Whatever great pride you may feel in his national as well as his international services, is matched by WCOTP members in Australia and Austria right through the alphabet to Uruguay, Yugoslavia,and Zambia.

There were present on that occasion representatives of teachers from Belgium, Canada, Eire, France, Malta, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Northern Ireland, Sarawak, Scotland, Sweden, Switzerland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, and Yugoslavia. We overseas observers were all put in the same hotel in Eastbourne and we became well acquainted as a result. During one of our informal evening meetings the subject of Russsian novels arose. I asked the three USSR delegates their opinion of *Dr. Zhivago* by Boris Pasternak. They consulted as though their future well-being depended on their reply, after which the interpreter said they preferred Pasternak's poetry. I told them "Zhivago" had been made into a very successful movie in the United States and asked if they had seen this motion picture tribute to a Nobel Prize-winning Russian author. They repeated that they preferred Pasternak's poetry. The Devil made me do it.

European regional conference

After the Eastbourne Conference, many of us moved to London for the WCOTP European Conference and Seminar. Attendence was good–91 participants from 35 teachers' organizations in 15 European countries.

Since 1970 was the 100th Anniversary of the NUT and the 100th Anniversary of the inauguration of public education in England, the central theme of the meeting was a review of recent trends in English education. Excellent papers were presented. The Minister for Education and Science, Mr. Edward Short, received the participants at Lancaster House. The Speaker of the House of Commons, Dr. Horace King, one of the five honorary members of the National Union of Teachers of England and Wales, received the participants in his rooms at Parliament House. There was an interesting combination of the traditional costume, wig,and regalia of the Speaker with his use of efficient closed circuit television to monitor the debates in the Commons.

I presided over the Seminar for part of the time, but I was less effective than usual, I believe, because I had somehow contracted a very bad cold with a good deal of pain in the chest.

During the London Conference too, I reminded my European friends that I would not remain as Secretary-General of WCOTP after the 1970 meeting in Sydney, Australia.

About the same time, I talked with Assistant Secretary-General of WCOTP, Mr. John M. Thompson. He had done excellent work since his appointment in 1959. I did hope that the Executive Committee would name Mr. Thompson as the new Secretary-General. We felt that when the position changed hands it would be desirable to move the office to Europe. This would in the long run save the Confederation some money because good office space and salaries for a competent staff would cost less in Europe than in North America. More important, it would deprive the detractors of WCOTP of one of their most injurious weapons against us—the picture of WCOTP with an American Secretary-General sitting in a Washington office and using the Confederation to advance the foreign policy goals of the United States. These charges could be answered and their mendacity proven, yet some of the stigma might remain. Besides it often happened that these spurious charges were made without our knowledge until it was too late for the truth to overtake them.

13 WCOTP: 1970, 1971, 1972

Sydney, 1970–Visits en route - Samoa - Fiji - Teacher recruitment - Equal opportunity - Tahiti; Jamaica, 1971–In Japan, "struggle" - Korea, a last look - Taiwan, an unforgettable ally; London, 1972–The purpose of power - Farewell to WCOTP.

SYDNEY 1970

We made three stops on the way to the 1970 Assembly in Sydney: Hawaii, American Samoa, and Fiji. We also planned to visit New Caledonia, but that was dropped from the itinerary when my wife became quite ill in Fiji.

Visits en route

In Hawaii my old friend Harlan Cleveland, President of the University of Hawaii, told me about cooperation between the University and American Samoa. I also spent an hour with Dr. Ernest Kleinjans, Chancellor of the famed East-West Center. The Center had just completed its first decade of existence and was inaugurating a multi-disciplinary approach to the study of five major regional problems: population, food, communication, technology, and culture.

Samoa

In Pago Pago, Samoa, the only United States territory in the Southern hemisphere, we were met by Pitia Sunia, Secretary of the teachers' association, a member of both the Territorial Legislature and Educational Administration. He gave us necklaces of the traditional cowrie shells.

The next day after a tour of the island we were the guests at a small dinner party given by Mr. and Mrs. Munday Johnston. She (Dr. Elizabeth Johnston) is Director of Primary Education in Samoa. The other two guests were Governor and Mrs. John Hayden.

The Governor and his wife are members of the Ripon Society, the more liberal wing of the Republican Party. They had entered on their responsibilities in Samoa with great energy, determined to recognize and develop the rights of the Samoan people. They had already completed the difficult task of calling in person on every village chief in the archipelago. The Governor wanted the Samoan people to assume added responsibility in the school system, including the well-known radio-TV education project.

The Haydens had recently turned the ground floor of the Governor's mansion into a museum of Samoan history and culture. The area had traditionally been used for a weekly cocktail party for all American tourists in Pago Pago. Many Samoans who visited the museum had never before set foot in the mansion; some of them wept for joy to see something done to preserve the indigenous culture. Classes of Samoan school children also visited the museum. Some of the dutifully composed letters of appreciation to the Haydens were displayed on a bulletin board. I noticed that the children's letters were ecstatic about the small corner of the historical museum which deals with the visits to Samoa after splashdown by several of the Apollo crews. Compared to these marvels the ancient arts of carving canoes, brewing kava, or making tapa cloth got little attention from the younger generation.

Fiji

We crossed the international dateline flying from Samoa to Fiji, thus arriving in Nandi almost a full day *before* we left Pago Pago.

Fiji, I found, has a substantial race problem. Thus, there are two teachers' organizations. The *Fijian* Teachers Association is composed of descendants of the indigenous people of the islands. The *Fiji* Teachers Union is composed of descendants of East Asians, mainly Hindu, who migrated to Fiji in the recent past. The Indians slightly outnumber the indigenous Fijians, and the current birthrate also favors the Indians. The Indians dominate the mercantile trades and most professional occupations – except teaching and nursing. Nearly all schools in Fiji are segregated by race and the Asian schools are also usually segregated by sex. The racial differences are compounded by cultural, religious, and linguistic differences between the two groups.

The social and educational consequences of the conditions just described are visible and disquieting, especially considering that since our visit the colonial status has been superseded by national independence. As far as teachers are concerned, I urged that their two organizations cooperate at once and move as quickly as possible to a merger. WCOTP assistance in Fiji has been predicated on that outlook.

Teacher recruitment

Arriving at last in Sydney, I found that one of the educational questions then occupying public attention was the efforts of the Australian Government to recruit teachers from abroad, especially from Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United States. I was questioned about this at almost every press conference, whether in Sydney, Melbourne, or Tasmania.

The gist of my public comment on this matter was as follows:

(1) International *exchange* of teachers should be encouraged but the Australian Government was apparently not interested in exchange;

(2) I did not think that their efforts to recruit teachers in North America would be very successful. Even with the payment of travel expense, the Australian salaries were far below those of the United States;

(3) Thus the teachers secured in this way would, for the most part, be (a) teachers unable to secure positions in the United States, and (b) adventurous teachers who were less interested in an educational career than in travel;

(4) I was astonished by the failure of the Australian Government to anticipate their own need for teachers and to take the necessary steps to secure them. As a prosperous country, Australia should be training all the teachers it needs plus a few for educational exchange, plus a few more who could be sent to help the less-developed countries of the world.

I had to allow myself, privately, a grudging admiration for the skill of the Australian overseas advertisements for teachers. They selected their bait very shrewdly for each country. In foggy old

England the advertisements spoke of the abundant fresh air and sunshine of Australia. In the United States they hinted that service in Australia would extract the teachers from their disorderly classrooms and danger in the streets to instruct eager well-mannered Australian youth.

The Assembly Theme for Sydney was "The Qualities of a Teacher." These qualities were considered in the general debate and in three smaller discussion groups: (1) Professional and Academic; (2) Ethical and Moral; and (3) Society and Community Relations. The conclusions of these discussions were, in part, predictable and, in part, unexpectedly far-reaching. Who in 1950 would have predicted, for instance, that in 20 years an international conference would be voting that "the teaching profession should have the *authority* to establish and *control* the standards and policies for admission to and *continuation in* professional practice"? (emphasis added).

For the formal opening session we were honored by an address by the Australian Prime Minister, then Mr. J. G. Gorton. This ceremony took place in the Sydney Town Hall and was well attended–as, indeed, were all our sessions in Sydney.

The Prime Minister's appearance at the Town Hall was picketed by about 200 teachers and other citizens denouncing his policies and activities. The pickets caused no serious difficulty in access to the building although both Mr. Gorton and I were pushed around when I escorted him into the Hall. Some of the pickets followed the Minister inside (the Inaugural Session was open to the public). The invaders took seats in the back of the house and heckled the Prime Minister during his speech, making it difficult at times to hear him clearly. When I moved the formal Vote of Thanks to the Minister, I rebuked these visitors for disturbance of a WCOTP meeting.

Many of the Prime Minister's views on education as delivered during his opening speech seemed to me ultra-conservative–the kind of opinions one might expect from a Prime Minister in the days of Queen Victoria rather than in the days of Queen Elizabeth II. He was, however, a persuasive and personable individual who would not be moved by any kind of demonstration, a man who would change his mind only by rational argument and specific facts and never by slogans, placards, chanting, and other substitutions for reason for which people now use the mob tactics called "confrontation."

An unfortunate byproduct of the picketing and harassment was that the newspapers gave their front pages and practically all the rest of their space to the Prime Minister, thus short-changing Sir Ronald Gould's final Presidential Address which was a brilliant one as usual.

As soon as I was no longer the Secretary-General, the Assembly elected me to a two-year term as President of WCOTP. Niamkey Adiko of the Ivory Coast was elected at Abidjan to a two-year term as Vice-President, and John Thompson was named as the new Secretary-General.

One of the most useful features of the 1970 meeting was the good will and skilled planning which allowed hundreds of Australians to become part of the WCOTP enterprise. For example:

Sir Ronald Gould spoke to the teachers of Western Australia
I spoke to teachers in Tasmania
The Victoria Teachers Union was host to a group of Singapore teachers
The Queensland Teachers Union invited the Japanese delegates to visit Brisbane
The South Australian Teachers provided a program for Indonesian delegates

Equal opportunity

The WCOTP quinquennial review of Equal Opportunity, voted in 1965 in Addis Ababa, was held in 1970 in Hamilton, New Zealand. The Seminar showed the advantage of a carefully-planned, small meeting where attendance is based on invitations so that there can be some selection of participants. Most of the participants stayed on the campus of Hamilton Teachers College—another advantage in carrying out an effective session.

Hamilton also developed a Friendship Night in which each participant was the guest of a different member of the Hamilton community. I had the good fortune to be assigned to Dr. Rangi, a retired dentist, the only Maori member of the Hamilton City Council. He gave me some comprehension of the possibilities as well as the difficulties of involving the Maori people with the European majority in New Zealand.

Following the Seminar I made a number of appearances before groups of teachers in the towns of Christchurch and Invercargill. The latter is on the southern tip of the southern island of New

Zealand. When the wind comes in there from the south one can tell that nothing lies between that point and the South Pole, except Antarctica and the almost frozen Antarctic Ocean.

Sir Ronald Gould had a similar speaking schedule. The officers of the New Zealand Educational Institute can say, to any member of the Institute who thinks that the Institute is giving too much attention to international matters, "we gave every teacher in New Zealand a chance to hear about WCOTP from its first President and its first Secretary-General."

Tahiti

The final stop on our way home was in Tahiti, the most pleasant spot of our entire tour.

The leaders of the local teachers' syndicate were at the airport to welcome us. Their organization is a kind of local branch of the SNI in Paris. They regard their overseas assignments as highly desirable in terms of salary and special allowances. Between the French teachers and the local Tahitian teachers a respectful distance is maintained, just as it is between the United States teachers and the Samoan teachers in Pago Pago. There is this difference in the two situations: in Tahiti nobody seems to worry about it; in Samoa, the Governor, the *palangi,* and the Samoans all worry about it. The tourism in Tahiti is horrendous. I feel sure it won't be long now before everybody starts to wrangle, wince, and worry there, just as we do everywhere else.

KINGSTON, JAMAICA 1971

There is not much for me to write about the WCOTP Assembly in Jamaica. I wasn't there. Instead, and to my great regret, I was convalescing at Georgetown University Hospital from a heart attack. I had worked very hard to write my first Presidential Address on the theme, "Education and Peace." But, since these pages are autobiographical, I need only say that the text was read for me, that the Assembly voted to make the same topic its major theme for 1973, and that everyone said the Vice-President did an excellent job.

Earlier that year I had made a Presidential visit to the members of WCOTP in Japan, Korea, and the Republic of China.

In Japan, "struggle"

In this, my last visit to Japan, I observed that the quarter-century of post-war economic recovery, displayed to the world by Expo 70 in Osaka, had been accompanied by portentous changes in Japanese mentality. The primary pre-war virtue of patriotism had been replaced, it seemed to me, by a self-conscious internationalism.

The opposition parties in Japan, with their allies in organized labor (including the teachers) had devoted their principal efforts for many years to influencing the foreign policy of Japan, of the United States, and of most other countries. These efforts were largely unsuccessful and the opposition was turning attention to "bread and butter" (more accurately, color television) issues. The "peace struggle" was at long last slowly replaced by the "livelihood struggle." But the word "struggle," with its overtones of militancy and threatened violence, remains.

For example, the Japan Teachers Union had recently created a new committee to consider how to make teachers' salaries and working conditions a *professional* issue. Until then teachers' salaries were almost automatically assumed to be a matter of economic and political power. The appointment of the new committee might turn out to have been an unimportant event, but it was significant to have reached a conclusion that the work of teachers might not be merely another problem in labor relations.

I found that the Japanese teachers were making substantial efforts to establish for themselves a position of leadership in relation to the teachers of other parts of East Asia. They had sent, within a year or so, missions to at least eight other Asian countries. Their explicit goal was to stir up interest in the UNESCO Recommendation on the Status of Teachers.

The political alignment of the Japan Teachers Union continued to puzzle me. The Japanese Diet in late 1970 was composed in the following fashion:

LPD	Liberal-Democratic Party	60%
JSP	Japan-Socialist Party	22%
KOMETTO	Clean-Government Party	10%
DSP	Democratic Socialist Party	5%
JCP	Japan Communist Party	3%

At the same time the 33 members of the Executive Committee of the JTU were distributed as follows:

JSP	Japan Socialist Party	91%
JCP	Japan Communist Party	9%
All others		none

The President of the JTU at the time I was in Tokyo was campaigning for election to the upper house of the Diet. He was subsequently elected in the general movement towards the Socialist Party.

My principal purpose in visiting Tokyo in 1971 was to assist in shaping up the manuscript for the updating of the WCOTP report on the Status of Teachers in Asia. The JTU had agreed to take the leadership in gathering the required data. This done, however, they needed help in organizing it and asked me to come to Tokyo for that purpose. With an excellent interpreter, I completed the job in three days of intensive work.

The JTU wanted the revised volume to have a title with more "zip" than that of the stodgy original edition—"Status of the Teaching Profession in Asia." I suggested as the title for the new edition, "Teachers of Asia: the Struggle for Professional Status." The suggestion was instantly accepted. The JTU would be happy with any title that contained the word "struggle."

Korea: a last look

I went to Korea primarily to see Tai Si Chung, the Executive Secretary of the Korean Federation of Education Associations. He had urged me to attend the groundbreaking ceremonies for the new KFEA headquarters but I was unable to go at that time.

I visited the site of the new KFEA headquarters, had discussions with the Minister of Education, and attended a dinner and reception at which nearly all of my old friends in Korea were present.

Not long after this visit Mr. Chung resigned from his position with KFEA and became President of a small college in Korea about halfway down the new superhighway between Seoul and the south coast port city of Pusan.

Tiawan: an unforgettable ally

With a ten percent per annum increase in Gross National Product, the Republic of China was doing well. Extensive land reforms have been made. Criticism of the ruling party is permitted, especially during elections. Health and nutrition standards are rising. The construction of schools and highways is booming as is the sale of automobiles and motorcycles.

Yet in April, 1970, the Deputy Prime Minster of China was picketted in New York City and an attempt was made on his life. Most people in Taiwan now have access to TV where US-made programs emphasizing dissidence, demonstrations, riots, confrontations, the counter-culture, and the disregard of youth for age are extremely popular.

The official position of government leaders and officials was one of supreme confidence. Since the United States Government allowed the Republic of China to be expelled from the United Nations and has not done anything effective to resist the other indignities to which that country has been subjected, confidence in the United States must be weakened no matter how brave a face the Republic of China reveals to the world. I did not feel that the words of solace and assurance which have emanated from the White House and other Washington sources are seriously believed in Taipei.

I will give one illustration. A certain Dr. Chen had been arrested and convicted in Taiwan on charges of treason and sedition. The *New York Times* had printed a substantial article supporting Dr. Chen. I had myself received letters from teachers in Sweden and West Germany asking me to help get him released. I had absolutely no information about the evidence in this affair, and I doubt if my correspondents did either. When I mentioned the case of Dr. Chen to a minor governmental official whom I had known for several years as a most equable, gentle and reasonable soul, he became quite angry. Not at me, but at the stupidity and hopeless bias of reporters who could weep about the imprisonment of one traitor and never say an effective word about the conversion of Mainland China, a once great country, into one vast prison, from which inmates daily risk their lives to escape, with hard labor, life sentences, and brutal treatment for its 700,000,000 inmates. This outburst was matched by other Chinese in other conversations.

LONDON, 1972

My term as WCOTP President ended with the adjournment of the 1972 Delegate Assembly in London. The meeting itself made no great demands on my ability as Chairperson. From my personal point of view it was the end of a long road beginning in Endicott in 1946. It was, on the whole, a pleasant journey and a demanding one. I felt, and still feel, that I left the future of the Confederation in very capable hands.

It was a large meeting–705 total attendance of whom 398 were delegates and an additional 234 were observers for the national member organizations which are the backbone of the Confederation.

Much as I might have wished otherwise, the question of WCOTP relationships with FISE had to be considered. The Soviet Teachers Union responded very late to our timely invitation to send a representative to London. They said they could not send even one observer because of their many duties in connection with the new changes in educational policies recently adopted by the Soviet Union.

On November 9, 1971, the WCOTP Secretary-General, John Thompson, following discussions at the Jamaica meeting of our Delegate Assembly, wrote a thoughtful and timely letter to FISE. Specifically, he proposed a joint discussion on one of the topics suggested by FISE on a previous occasion, namely, the civil and professional liberties of teachers. He proposed that for the purpose of discussion, attention should be directed mainly to teachers in the public service. He suggested that FISE and WCOTP should each select five countries in which they have national members and that experienced members appointed by these ten national teachers' organizations meet to compare their problems and discuss the issues involved. If they produced a report, it would be distributed by FISE and WCOTP to all their member organizations. FISE and WCOTP would organize the meeting but would not confront the two delegations. If this proposal was not acceptable to FISE, Mr. Thompson concluded, alternative suggestions were awaited.

Eight months later, on July 10, 1972, FISE replied in the negative and immediately published the reply in its "International Teachers News." The FISE reply was probably sent to their printer simultaneously with its dispatch to WCOTP.

The general reaction of the Executive Committee on July 29 was one of indignation. Every member who spoke on the subject resented the long delay, the timing of the reply, and its simultaneous publication. The only difference within the Committee was whether it should continue to write FISE in conciliatory terms.

The conclusion of the Executive Committee was that it would not give FISE a reply that would enable its partisans to blame WCOTP for lack of cooperation.

I am personally convinced that as long as the Communist Party continues to control the Soviet State and the Soviet State in turn continues to control the national union of educational workers, no useful contact between FISE and WCOTP can be foreseen.

The purpose of power

Since the London meeting would be my last official contact with WCOTP, I made no attempt in my Presidential Address to speak on the special theme of the London meeting: "The Articulation of Primary, Secondary, and Higher Education." I decided instead to offer some thoughts to teachers on "The Purpose of Power." I noted that the power of the teaching profession had been rapidly and markedly increased. Teachers had, chiefly by organizing themselves, acquired substantial power in human affairs. There would be and could be no retreat from this achievement; on the contrary, the power of teachers, organized nationally and internationally, was almost sure to increase. The great question before the profession, now that it had moved from frailty to strength, was how that strength would be used. The rising generation of young leaders in the teachers' organizations of the world would have to make some decisions that would probably be irreversible. Would the new-found power of teachers be used chiefly to improve the personal well-being of teachers or to improve the quality of teaching? Would power be used to claim rights or to meet responsibilities? I did not think the profession had to choose one of these purposes to the complete exclusion of the other, but I did think it must determine the proper balance between the two.

I warned teachers of three dangers ahead in the use of organized power.

1. The danger of assuming that education and schooling are identical. This might cause teachers to promise for schooling more than it can deliver, with consequent public disappointment and irritation. It might also prevent teachers from recognizing and dealing with the powerful impacts of out-of-school learning.

2. The danger of dissipating the real power of schooling in a constant turmoil of adaptation to transient fads in education. The "Educational Follies of 1972," I said, included the uncritical adulation of the adolescent, the fear of excellence, and the worship of change for its own sake.
3. The danger, most serious of all, of a rapid and persistent decline of public confidence in teachers and schools.

I shall not attempt to further summarize the course of these remarks. They received unusual attention, most of it quite favorable, from the press, from teachers outside of the governing bodies of teachers' organizations, and from many of the official delegates. There were some delegates, of course, who felt that the Presidential Address had warned them to stop doing what they were then doing. This was, of course, quite true. Whether I caused any change in attitude or policy I shall never know but I am glad that I occupied, however briefly, a platform where I could say what I believed.

The London Assembly was composed of delegations of national teachers' organizations in 65 countries. I am glad to be able to say that as the presiding officer I was able to elicit an unusually brisk discussion from the floor and, as I thought, to keep that discussion focused rather clearly on the particular issue before the Assembly.

Farewell to WCOTP

Just before the meeting adjourned I handed the President's gavel to my successor, Niamkey Adiko of the Ivory Coast. He then said that a representative of each area of the world would, in succession, say a few words about my work for WCOTP.

> Motofumi Makeida (Japan) speaking for the Asia-Pacific region spoke especially about my efforts to bring into existence the international Recommendation Concerning the Status of Teachers. He presented me with a Japanese vase as a remembrance of our frequent work together.
>
> Norman Goble (Canada) speaking for North America made some very complimentary remarks about my Presidential Address. He said that I had lived by the

> conviction that the teaching profession "must not abdicate its responsibility no matter how stern and perplexing the challenge of our times may be."
>
> Ocyron Cunha (Brazil) speaking for South America said that farewells were sad events. He hoped in my case the parting would be eased by knowledge that I had fulfilled my duty to the teaching profession of the United States and of the world. He gave me in a little leather bag a Brazilian aquamarine and asked me to give it to my wife with the appreciation of the teachers of Latin America.
>
> Ora Horton (Liberia) recalled the first time we had met (in Copenhagen, in 1952). At that time she was the only delegate from Africa, and she noted with gratitude the growth of WCOTP membership and influence in that continent. She also thanked my wife, saying (quite correctly) that she was very much missed at the London Assembly.
>
> A. M. Farrugia (Malta) speaking for Europe said he was proud that WOTP had met in Malta in 1951 and that the Malta Union of Teachers was one of the founders of WCOTP. The extraordinary growth of the Confederation was to be expected under the leadership I had provided.
>
> Catherine Barrett (United States) had the last word in this series, speaking about my services both to NEA and WCOTP.

John Thompson, my successor as Secretary-General, then made some remarks about me. As I read them at this moment I find them, even after a lapse of years, so obviously sincere and so filled with golden opinions that I really cannot bring myself to quote or even to summarize them. That these words, like those of the others who spoke that afternoon, were entirely sincere I have no doubt. Nor can I doubt that, especially in the case of John Thompson speaking for the WCOTP Secretariat, the remarks were based on an extended and detailed experience in working together with me. Thus I consider their sincerity the highest tribute I could possibly receive.

As he concluded his remarks, Mr. Thompson, acting now on behalf of the Executive Committee, presented to me the William

F. Russell Award Medal, the award having been established by WCOTP for distinguished service to international education in memory of the late William F. Russell with whom I had been very closely associated during the years from 1947 to 1952 when the idea of an international teachers' organization was struggling for survival.

Then Mrs. Saunders (Jamaica), the new WCOTP Vice-President, presented me with a handsome inscribed silver tray on behalf of the Exeuctive Committee.

To all of this I was then invited to respond. I was unable to do so adequately. I thanked members of the Assembly for including my wife in their good wishes. It was a sorrow to both of us that her health did not permit her to come with me to London. I thanked all those who had participated in these ceremonies in London, and I broadened these thanks to include all those former delegates and committee members who could not be in London but whose work in previous years had made the Confederation a strong and widely-respected international organization. And so, with a mixture of pride and relief, sorrow and hope, I bade them, as individuals and as an organization, good-bye and good luck.

14 The NEA: Press and Public Relations

Executive Secretary, National Education Association - Press and Public Relations - A bid for partners - The free press - The sensitive plant - The press strikes back - Some successes - The Magazine Publishers - The public schools and the churches - Moral and spiritual values - An off-the-record meeting - Clash in the NEA Board of Directors - The disputed role of the public schools - The possible partnership - Public opinion.

On January 17, 1952 I was called to New York City where the NEA Board of Trustees was in session in the old Pennsylvania Hotel. There I was told that the Trustees had on the previous evening voted unanimously to invite me to serve as Executive Secretary of the National Education Association for four years, the maximum term permitted under the NEA's Charter from Congress, commencing August 1, 1952. This was the date when Willard Givens would retire because of age from the Executive Secretaryship which he had held with great devotion and ability for fifteen years.

Executive Secretary, National Education Association

I accepted the appointment and was subsequently re-elected by successive Boards of Trustees for additional four-year terms in 1956, 1960, and 1964.

The news of the appointment was, I thought, well received by the officers and members of the Association. The Chairperson of the NEA Board of Trustees said that the Association, under the leadership of my predecessors, James Crabtree and Willard Givens, had become the world's largest professional organization.

One of the professional journals compared the NEA to a giant tree which had experienced remarkable growth and little pruning. It suggested that the new Executive Secretary should commence by removing certain unspecified accumulations of dead wood. There was no suggestion, however, that substantial additional growth in membership and membership income was probable.

Another editorial said that I had a logical mind but no administrative experience, that I was more likely to be at home in developing policy rather than in inventing methods to achieve objectives, and that I could write persuasively and make a good speech but had yet to show whether or not I could be equally effective in action. These were, I think, accurate warnings.

The reaction from other countries was generally quite favorable. I was particularly pleased by a clipping from the Red Deer, Alberta, *Advocate,* carrying the news that a boy educated in the grammar school of that little town had gone abroad and received some recognition.

As I stir my memory, aided by numerous documents regarding this period of my life, I can see that here, more even than elsewhere in this story, a comprehensive account is impossible. Accordingly, I propose to deal with only a few of the varied issues which arose in my work as Executive Secretary of the NEA:

1. The press and public relations
2. Federal school legislation
3. Civil rights
4. Dangers to the independence of the teaching profession
5. The search for quality in education
6. General NEA administrative issues and policies

THE PRESS AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

When my appointment as Executive Secretary was announced, the press and public relations personnel of the NEA staff suggested that I submit to an inauguration ceremony similar to those which are usually held for the formal installation of a college president. Such an event, they argued, would make not only teachers but also the general public more sharply aware of the value and importance of the National Education Association.

A bid for partners

I agreed that such a function be organized provided it could be held at a time and place that would permit the NEA elected officers and directors to attend, and provided that the central theme of the installation ceremonies be the betterment of relations between the public and the schools. To that end, school board members, parents, and representatives of various civic groups were invited to attend and to take part in the activities. My inaugural address, an appeal for informed public support of the schools, bore the self-explaining title: "Help wanted." The spirit that I hoped to generate through the inaugural ceremony is conveyed in the closing paragraphs of my inaugural address:

> We can summarize what teachers want to say to the public today in terms of an advertisement that might well be printed in large type in every newspaper in the land:
>
> "HELP WANTED. Large national enterprise needs partners prepared to invest their time and thoughts. This enterprise operates in every section of the nation, has one million employes, serves thirty million clients. Product is essential to national security. Plans are ready now for needed expansion of plant and modernization of program. Generous compensation and guaranteed dividends, payable on demand in the currency of United States freedom and progress. Partners share fully in control of enterprise. No silent partners wanted. For details apply at your nearest school board office, P.T.A., or citizens' committee."

The inauguration as a whole was, I think, quite successful. The principal shortcoming was my press conference. About thirty reporters attended. The conference lasted about forty minutes during which a total of eleven questions were asked and answered. Ten of these questions were all on one topic–communism in American schools, among American teachers, in American textbooks. Some of the press questions were such as a prosecuting attorney might direct toward an unwilling witness; some questions were, in effect, lengthy indictments to which I was apparently expected to plead guilty or not guilty, hopefully the former.

A variety of other topics were suggested by our press "handouts." They included: progressive education, teaching the fundamentals, school finance, character development in schools, and juvenile delinquency. None of these other issues aroused the slightest curiosity among the reporters.

I was asked what I intended to do about the communist propaganda in American textbooks. When I replied that I knew of no such infected textbooks, the entire press corps there present reacted with incredulity. For many months they had been writing, and their papers had been printing, "news stories" relating the latest scare on this topic, which was then the fashionable criticism of the schools. Thus my declaration of its invalidity was to them proof of either my duplicity or my naive ignorance of what "everybody knew." It was, I suppose, asking too much of human nature to expect any of the reporters to wonder whether *they* might have been wrong all the time and whether they had been misinforming the American people.

Fortunately for the success of the inaugural impact in the press, Douglas Larsen, a correspondent for the Newspaper Enterprise Association, had a separate interview with me. His by-lined article, while in no wise panegyric, was a fair and realistic summary and was widely printed. The general purpose of the event was further advanced by the speakers in the program, including among others Secretary of the Army Frank Pace; Earl McGrath, the United States Commissioner of Education; William Russell and Henry Hill, Presidents respectively of Teachers College, Columbia University and the George Peabody College for Teachers. Cordial good wishes were received from Dwight D. Eisenhower and Adlai Stevenson, the Presidential candidates that year.

There was one newspaper of national importance which in my experience was invariably fair and straightforward in reporting educational events. That was *The Christian Science Monitor.* Its education editor, Millicent Taylor, was kind enough to tell her readers that she had found the new Executive Secretary ready to respond clearly and concisely to questions from the Press and that I appreciated the important influence of the Press in the new role that I was undertaking. The first part of that comment was certainly gratifying and the second part was certainly true. I do not know how long Miss Taylor retained her good opinion of me but I continued to welcome her accurate reporting for as many years as I can remember.

The free press

My experience in the next fifteen years led me to some serious questions about how well the free press in the United States is serving the public interest. As a basis for further consideration of this issue I shall describe a specific event which came under my personal observation. The event itself, I must emphasize, was of transitory importance but the conclusions to which it led me are disquieting.

In July 1962, the NEA Delegate Assembly met in Denver, Colorado. In his development of the program of speakers, the NEA President suggested a symposium in which representatives of major segments of American life would state their views about needed changes in American schools. We finally settled on three speakers:

> Charles Percy, Chairman of the Board, Bell and Howell Co. (now a United States Senator)
>
> Palmer Hoyt, Editor and Publisher of the *Denver Post*
>
> James Carey, President of the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, AFL-CIO

Mr. Carey, to my great surprise, devoted major parts of his speech to a slashing attack on the General Electric Company, a glowing tribute to the American Newspaper Guild (AFL-CIO), and a vigorous plea that teachers also organize themselves in labor unions. He pointed out that the teachers' union in New York City had recently won an election to represent teachers in collective bargaining.

At this point in his address, a voice in the balcony called out: "Five Hundred Thousand Dollars!" There was no disturbance at all except these four words shouted by one person in the balcony. Mr. Carey paused momentarily, perhaps ten seconds, denied that this had been the amount spent to win the New York City teachers' election, and continued and completed his address. He received polite applause when he completed his remarks.

The next morning, "the wire services, network TV and radio broadcasts and some newspapers reported that Carey's remarks praising a recent New York City teachers' strike set off an uproar among the delegates which completely disrupted the convention session in City Auditorium Arena. One Eastern broadcast said that Carey had been booed off the stage. . .Carey, reached at his home in Washington, said he did not feel that he was rudely treated. . .'I expected some reaction,' he said, 'but the crowd was well-behaved.'"

The foregoing sentences are quoted from page 21 of the *Denver Post* for Friday, July 6. The speech by Mr. Carey was delivered on Tuesday evening, July 3, and reported on the front page of the *Denver Post* the following day, July 4.

The headline on the *Denver Post* article from which I have just quoted read as follows: "*Nationwide Ruckus*: NEA Delegates Think Reports of Carey Talk Exaggerated." Thus, even in its belated half-hearted retraction, this newspaper still managed to leave an incorrect impression for its headline readers. The reports of the Assembly reaction to the Carey speech were not "exaggerated;" they were, quite simply, false.

One of the most amazing aspects of this episode is the fact that Palmer Hoyt, the highly esteemed editor and publisher of the *Denver Post,* happened to be one of the speakers on the platform that Tuesday evening. He witnessed the entire event and he must have known that the story his paper had published was untrue. Mr. Hoyt told me later that the story had been written by a reporter for his paper. I asked Mr. Hoyt if he had reprimanded the reporter. He replied, with mellow tolerance, that he had not, adding "these fellows all belong to the Guild, you know."

I have related this episode, perhaps in greater detail than necessary, in order to make two points; namely, (1) I have found the American press frequently careless, sometimes inaccurate, and occasionally mendacious; and (2) it is virtually impossible for the victims of such negligence, error, or falsehood to overcome the damage that has been done to them.

The sensitive plant

One of the most serious shortcomings of the American press is its extreme sensitivity to even the most cautious and considerate criticism. The press can "dish it out" but is typically unable to "take it." Any criticism is immediately denounced as an attack on the freedom of the press. Witness, for instance, the growing tendency of the organized press to give currency to rumors, guesses, and gossip. Witness, also, the indignation displayed when a reporter is asked to tell where he or she obtained some dubious bit of "information from highly-placed sources." The public is apparently expected to accept such "information." Even to ask a question about its origin is regarded as an attack on the First

Amendment in the Bill of Rights. If the source of information is relevant to the evidence in a civil or criminal case, the valiant reporter who refuses to reveal the sources is proclaimed by colleagues a public hero. The organized press, in fact, has sought the enactment of "shield" laws which in effect allow a reporter to publish anything he or she wishes and then to refuse to tell from whence the information was obtained, even to be immune from court orders. Thus the reporter enjoys a protection to slant news as he or she wishes and is accountable, in effect, to no one for publishing a falsehood. The reporter may secure "information" by peering at papers on office desks, eavesdropping on private conversations or telephone calls, employing spies, or even inventing the report completely, as was done in the case of the Denver episode just related.

The competitive position in which some newspapers and broadcasting stations find themselves does not improve their accuracy in reporting. Under other circumstances, competition might help. However, in a business where being first with the news is given a very high value, although that "value" is of little real importance to readers, the almost inevitable result is inaccuracy.

But competition among the news media produces results even more unfortunate than premature and untruthful publicity. It also causes the press almost invariably to exaggerate. Thousands are reported dead on the day of an earthquake or other national disaster. Three days later we find the same media scaling down their estimates of human mortality. The same voracious drive to clutch the maximum of public attention also assures the public that whatever aspect of an event is most shocking, unusual, or frightening is reported first while reassuring materials await attention in subsequent editions, probably several hours or several days later—or perhaps never.

The press strikes back

Anyone who criticizes the press is almost sure to be in deep trouble. I venture to write these pages now only because I am no longer in a position where systematic adverse publicity can injure the institution with which I used to be connected. Had I written or published these observations whilst I was still the NEA Executive Secretary, the officers of the Association might well have felt obliged to remove me for the good of the organization. A "bad press" is not an imaginary and trifling affliction; it is, in fact, painful and long-lasting.

Of course, one can always write a letter to the editor. If it is published at all it will not be printed as something to which the letter-writer is entitled as a matter of right. It will be made to appear as an act of kind generosity. Many such letters are never published. The decision on whether to publish rests with the newspaper or magazine. The letter may be edited and the amount and nature of such editing is not under the author's control. The author may not know whether his or her letter has been edited until it appears in print. Furthermore, many publications have the nasty habit of inserting, after a letter of complaint or rebuttal, five or six additional lines, usually stressed by italics, and signed by "Ed." So "Ed." has the last word after all. If you want to correct us, they say in effect, go and buy yourself a newspaper and a chain of radio stations.

Perhaps the most obnoxious trait of the daily newspaper is its charade of impartiality. I remember an occasion about 1940 when one of the big newsmagazines ran a feature on the public school. An important part of the feature was an illustrated account of a visit to an American high school. I shall not go into details; the article was a squalid and pernicious caricature of that school, or of any other high school in the land.

A representative of the high school principals' association wrote a review of the article in which he pointed out error after error. He said that he would not recommend for high school libraries a magazine which had shown itself to be so malicious and biased. Instantly, the American Civil Liberties Union, without a hearing and with no examination of the merits of the case, publicly denounced the review, its author, and its sponsor as an attack on the freedom of the press. Of course the press generally gave the ACLU denunciation full coverage and the original sins of the magazine received no attention whatever.

Part of the general problem with the daily press arises, in my opinion, from a profound and basic confusion in the view held by the Lords of the Fourth Estate regarding their basic function. It has become fashionable nowadays for the press to assert that it must hold "an adversary relationship" with established authority. The phrase has most recently been applied to the White House and its principal occupant but it is applied also (although with far less important results) to any position of responsibility.

Whether applied to the White House or to those who hold lesser responsibilities, the phrase "adversary relationship" is in my view dangerous nonsense. The problem arises, I believe, from neglect of the distinction between reporting events and offering editorial judgments. Both functions are and should be fully protected under the First Amendment. However it is not rational to speak of an adversary relationship in the reporting of *events*. Even in editorial judgment it is surely not necessary to require an unremitting "adversary relationship." An editor ought to be free to agree once in a while without suffering the odium of professional malpractice. The editor may become an adversary when driven to it but he or she ought to feel free to be an ally without shame.

The line between fact and opinion is, in principle, easily defined. In practice, and in specific circumstances, it is more difficult. This practical difficulty, however, does not mean that the effort to distinguish fact and opinion is irrelevant or that a deliberate fogginess about the distinction between the two is a laudable characteristic or a proper objective of a free press.

I am not the only American who has been profoundly troubled by lack of responsibility and accuracy in much of the Press. President Thomas Jefferson, after six years in office, commented bitterly:

"Nothing can now be believed which is seen in a newspaper. Truth itself becomes suspicious by being put into that polluted vehicle." (quoted in Gilbert Highet's "Talents and Geniuses," p. 141).

Some successes

I think I may include among my all-too-few success stories in public relations the establishment and operation of the Joint Committee of the NEA and the Magazine Publishers Association, the regular practice of presenting educational policies to the drafting sessions of the Resolutions Committees of the two major parties, the efforts to minimize ridiculing of the stereotyped "schoolmarm" teacher, stressing the need for better public relations for schools, and the establishment of media contact offices of the NEA in Los Angeles and New York City.

The Magazine Publishers

The Joint Committee of the NEA and the Magazine Publishers Association was, I think, the first addition I made to the NEA structure. Magazine publicity for education was in the 1940's at a low point. Most magazine publishers seemed to believe that their readers were interested only in adverse reports on school problems.

One kind of criticism declared that the schools were making our children into "softies." School buildings were too handsome, the lessons too easy, the desks too comfortable, the teachers too eager. Youth should learn to struggle for an education. School policy should be tough-minded. The school system needed more iron in the blood and more lime in the bone.

On the other hand, other writers accused the schools of indifference to human problems, teaching unquestioning obedience, enforcing needless lock-step regimentation, requiring too much homework, using threats and examinations and punishments. The critics agreed on one point only: that the public schools were "failures."

I was much aware of the confusion and damage done by this incessant scolding of the schools. I could not see how to deal with the situation until one day in 1953 a group representing the Magazine Publishers Association came to my office. They came to ask how magazines could be introduced into the schools as curricular materials. Their motivation was entirely honest and respectable. They were shocked when I told them that a growing number of teachers looked upon magazines as an ill-informed or malicious enemy, that the number of such teachers was sure to increase unless some current practices in magazine publishing were changed, and that for these reasons their efforts to increase circulation by the cooperation of teachers were not likely to succeed in the current climate of teacher opinion.

They left my office that afternoon committed to a major effort to educate magazine publishers, editors, and writers in the facts about public education. The Joint Committee was the embodiment of that decision.

Largely as a result of this Joint Committee's efforts, I was able to report by 1956 that the number of articles about education per year in magazines of general circulation rose from 120 in 1950, to 319 in 1953, to 489 in 1956. Many of the writers secured part or all of their background material from the NEA. While we could not expect all such articles to be uncritical, the schools received a notably more friendly and intelligent treatment in the national journals of general readership.

The public schools and the churches

During my years in the service of the National Education Association, the relationships between the Association and the various church groups in the United States were, in the main, cooperative, calm, and commonplace. An unfortunate exception to this rule was the frequent confrontations between the Association and spokespersons for the Roman Catholic Church. I hope and believe that these relationships were better when I left office in 1967 than they were when I began to work in Washington in 1929. But the road was often rough and tortuous.

There were two main issues between the Church and the NEA. One issue was the matter of Federal funds for education; the second issue was whether the public school could soundly educate young Americans without teaching the precepts of the Catholic, or at least the Christian, faith. The two issues were both important and mutually exacerbating. Events relating to the first issue are to be related in another chapter on school legislation by the Congress.

Moral and spiritual values

As mentioned briefly in a preceding chapter, the Educational Policies Commission published in 1950 a small book giving its views on how public schools could teach moral and spiritual values. Some readers endorsed the book, some agreed with parts of it, some rejected it completely and gave their reasons for doing so. These were the normal responses, fully anticipated by the sponsoring Commission.

Unfortunately, however, the range from endorsement to dissent did not embrace all of the reactions. There was another kind of response of which I shall give some examples.

Monsignor Fulton Sheen, in a statement as widely circulated as any that flowed from his eloquent pen, wrote that the book meant that public education had denied any responsibility for the teaching of ethics and morals. He did not assert that public education was *ineffective* in this respect. He said quite plainly that the public schools *did not wish to teach* morals and ethics and had, in fact, disclaimed responsibility for doing so.

A week or so later, a professor at Catholic University deplored the lack of chastity among American youth and attributed this calamity "to the rejection of religious and moral instruction *in the public schools"* (italics added). I wondered, as I read those words, whether he thought that students and graduates of private schools were invariably chaste.

Another eminent Catholic educator characterized the Commission report, on which such distinguished citizens as James Conant and Dwight Eisenhower had labored for over two years, as "unbelievably stupid." He also said that the EPC report admonished teachers never to use the word "God." I could scarcely believe my eyes when I read these comments, for the report neither made nor even vaguely implied such a suggestion. Yet my polite letter to this commentator on this point remained unanswered.

Bishop O'Hara wrote that the report had proposed a doctrine of state religion. That is precisely what the report did not say. Bishop O'Hara was soon thereafter made Archbishop of Philadelphia.

In short the report was condemned for saying things that it did not say, and condemned for failing to say things that it did say. These statements, widely publicized by Catholic leaders, remained, as far as I know, uncorrected by any other Church leaders.

An off-the-record meeting

Late in 1951, while the fever of controversy over "Moral and Spiritual Values" was still acute, I was greatly pleased, and even more greatly surprised, to receive an invitation to confer off-the-record with the Department of Superintendence of the National Catholic Education Association at its annual meeting in Baltimore. The group of about 150 men consisted almost entirely of those members of the clergy who served as diocesan school superintendents of the Roman Catholic parochial schools across the United States. I accepted the invitation at once, for I regarded it as a signal by a powerful group of at least a willingness to parley in the midst of the controversy.

I determined to attempt both candor and conciliation simultaneously. I spoke of my appreciation for the invitation to meet in "this friendly setting where we can speak to each other as fellow Americans attacking an important problem rather than attacking one another." I said that the public was deeply and properly concerned about enfeebled moral and spiritual values, appalled by threatening new international tensions, and by the signs of corruption in government. (That was in 1951!) Our democratic ideals, I said, were being challenged "not only by dictatorships abroad but also by demagogues at home. This is no time for Americans to dissipate their energies in needless quarrels."

Continuing in this vein, I drew attention to several matters on which I thought both public and parochial schools could agree:

- The supreme importance of the human personality is basic to many great religions, as well as to democratic institutions.
- Children learn values from example as well as from exhortation, from practice as well as from precept.
- Religious freedom and tolerance should be accepted and taught as an important ingredient of the American heritage.
- Schools of all kinds should plan their programs with an eye to the support they can enlist from the community as well as to the opposition they may encounter from the same source.

Once past this, or some other, list of agreements, we must also in candor note the necessary deep differences in approach between public and parochial schools, I said. Catholic schools have been established to teach within the framework of the Catholic religion. They deal with children and parents of substantially identical religious convictions. Public schools, on the other hand, are responsive to citizens holding mixed or missing religious views. They are expected to provide a common education to persons of widely varied religious faiths.

My speech—and the subsequent extended discussion—was, I thought, received with great courtesy—so much so, indeed, that I began to feel a little like an alien ambassador in a highly civilized but essentially wary and circumspect court. Such a relationship, I felt, was much better than open hostility but was still far short of mutual trust and partnership.

Clash in the NEA Board of Directors

For its opposition to Federal aid to public education, the freewheeling three-way alliance between the right wing of the Republican Party, the most conservative Southern Democrats, and the leading spokespersons for the Catholic Church had been almost one-hundred-percent effective for many years. I had been sharply aware of this fact before I became Executive Secretary of the NEA. After that event. I quickly discovered that the controversy extended into the supposedly solid ranks of NEA officialdom. At the meeting of the NEA Board of Directors in October 1952, I heard and witnessed for the first time the bitterness of the debate on "the public schools *versus* the private schools," as some people chose to put it. The immediate question concerned the selection of a speaker for the preceding annual convention, but once the issue was presented the ancient rancors broke loose in full fury.

That evening, as I reviewed with anxious care the events of my first full day of official meeting with the NEA Board of Directors, I concluded that it was imperative to cool off these indignations immediately. I decided that, at the first opportunity the following morning, I would take the floor myself, not as another combatant but as a member of the medical corps to bind up wounds, to tranquilize the suffering, and to defuse the still smoldering explosives on the field of battle.

The Board of Directors, I said, was entitled to know the spirit in which I was prepared to administer the Association's policies in this controversy. This spirit was of at least equal importance to the precise texts of the Board's meticulously drafted resolutions. We had excellent authority to regard the spirit as the life-giving element in our corporate actions.

First, I said, the Association is not, and will not become, a critic or adversary of any religious faith. The religious opinions of NEA members and officers are exclusively their own private business.

Second, the spirit of my administration would go beyond a mere antiseptic tolerance to recognize the positive value of diverse opinions.

Third, the Association is not opposed to private schools. It is for public schools; it is for private schools; it is for *schools*. It exists to serve all teachers wherever they are found. The Association does not regard private schools as a necessary evil.

Fourth, since most teachers are in public schools, most of the NEA resources will be devoted to public schools. Whoever opposes adequate support for public schools will, if possible, be persuaded to change his or her mind. Failing that, such opinions must be opposed with all our energies, no matter who advances them and regardless of their religious or political affiliations.

Finally, the NEA is concerned with the separation of Church and State insofar as this principle affects education. The Association should not be involved in such questions as, "Will the United

States have an ambassador at the Vatican?" or "Can Catholic judges properly interpret the laws about divorce?" The NEA, I said, should not become an adjunct to pressure groups on either side of these essentially non-educational aspects of Church-State relationships.

This statement seemed to give universal satisfaction to the embattled Directors of all opinions. They voted to include my statement, *verbatim,* in the official minutes, with copies to be made available at once to all officers and administrative staff.

From this experience I learned that, when one attempts to soothe a raging debate, it is usually best to let the issue cool overnight. A similar statement given at the height of the turmoil would probably have produced less pacific results.

I learned also that newly-installed officers can gain acceptance which might be withheld from them when custom has staled their persuasiveness.

Of course, the storm could not be completely or permanently stilled. It would recur repeatedly but it never again raged at such a high pitch as it did at that 1952 meeting. On such dissensions, even a small improvement or a brief delay is cause for gratitude.

The disputed role of the public schools

On January 10, 1955, the Educational Policies Commission, of which by that time I had become a member *ex-officio,* published a book entitled, *Public Education and the Future of America.* The Commission felt that, in view of the general public concern about the public schools, and in view of the changing issues in American life which the public schools might help to mitigate or resolve, the time had come for a fresh statement on the role of public elementary and secondary education. The little book was based on a manuscript prepared for the Commission by Lawrence Cremin, Associate Professor of Education (and subsequently President) of Teachers College, Columbia University.

Within three days, like a bolt of lightning in a cloudless sky, the full wrath of Catholic denunciation fell upon our booklet. We did not expect or wish to be immune from public criticism. But criticism from that particular quarter was as totally unexpected as was the ferocity and thrust of the attack itself.

Monsignor Hochwalt, Director of the Department of Education, National Catholic Welfare Conference, led the assault. That surprised me, too, for I thought he would not take such a step without at least informing me. Father Hochwalt and I had been close friends. We had worked together on delegations to various UNESCO meetings.

He wrote that "any plan to force all children into a common school is a serious threat to the future welfare of our nation." But the Commission report did not constitute, include, or propose such a plan. On the contrary the report very clearly declared that the option to attend private schools should always be available.

The attack on the Educational Policies Commission thus reached its high point in a defiant demolition of a straw man. Catholic educators and parents, wrote Monsignor Hochwalt, "are ready to meet the challenge. . .They will resist every effort to seek laws that would force all children to attend public schools. They will not be intimidated." He concluded by equating the support of public education with "totalitarianism." Since the notion of forcing all children to attend public schools had never entered our minds, this identification of our motives was galling.

To support the initial onslaught, the considerable and unified force of the Catholic press was marshalled against one small book which contained not one word criticizing the private schools and not a line that questioned their right to continue. What the Commission said was scarcely noticed. Attention was centered on our supposedly secret and evil motives. It was even asserted, completely contrary to fact, that the Educational Policies Commission wished the Supreme Court to reconsider its 1925 decision in the Oregon case declaring the right of private schools to exist. As the stridency of the attack mounted, the Commission was compared to the dictatorship of Adolf Hitler. Its methods were likened to those used by the communist brainwashers who assaulted American prisoners taken in the Korean War. A cartoon in the Catholic newspaper circulated in the Wisconsin area pictured the NEA as a skulking ruffian disguised in academic robes leading forth a slavering wolf to prey upon innocent terrified children in the private schools. The chain around the wolf's neck was ingeniously drawn of small interlinked swastikas, hammers, and sickles. The accompanying text was of the same general character.

Such materials provoked the inevitable escalating responses and unleashed the forces of bigotry on both sides of the issue.

The possible partnership

Just as the attack on "Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools" was promptly followed by the unexpected invitation to address the Diocesan Superintendents in Baltimore, so in like fashion the assault on "Public Education and the Future of America" was followed closely by an invitation to take part in a public symposium in 1956 in Milwaukee marking the seventy-fifth Anniversary of Marquette University. Again I accepted and prepared my observations with great care.

My assigned topic was "Partnership of Independent and Public Schools." In my first sentence I seized on that word, "partnership" and clung to it grimly through my forty minutes at the podium.

"We already know," I said, "that both kinds of schools can operate in the United States—they have done so throughout our history. We do not inquire whether they can coexist. We ask whether they can work together." Is partnership - "a fruitful voluntary cooperation in meeting a shared responsibility" - possible?

There is dictionary trouble ahead, I continued, arising from the wording of my assigned topic.

We call schools that are subject to state control *public schools.*

We call schools that are not subject to state control *private schools.*

Clear enough; but my assigned topic used another adjective - "independent" schools. If the use of this term gives private schools a feeling of pride and a determination to maintain their freedom, I could welcome the usage.

Still, it is not irrelevant to ask what those private schools are independent of. Surely they do not claim to be independent of the broad social policies of the nation. Their programs reflect the policy of the sponsoring church or some other private body. In this sense, some private schools may be more responsive to external influences than some public schools since the latter can often counterbalance one pressure with another, a process which the private school can rarely follow.

By an independent school we should mean one that is under a separate administration, as fully protected as possible against the extreme demands of partisanship, with a staff which owes no corporate allegiance to any single economic or partisan interest. In that sense, I claimed, the assigned topic makes an inaccurate comparison since the public school equally merits the term independent. It is not properly limited to religious schools only.

But in the last analysis, I said, "no school is completely independent. A school which relies on the inspiration, faith, and authority of a great religious system is dependent on that system. A school which relies on the power and will of a democratic state is dependent on the judgment of the electorate and its elected officials. The church school is independent of the state. The state school is independent of the church. Yet complete autonomy is possible in neither case. Both depend on the accepted moral values of our culture. Both depend for economic support on the general prosperity and productivity of the nation. And both depend on public opinion."

I concluded my plea for partnership by an appeal to the leadership of both public and private schools. This was not merely, I said, a plea for restrained and considerate civility, although this would certainly help. It was a plea that teachers and those who spoke for teachers exhibit some of the qualities we recommended to our students. It was one thing to say that one's opponent was in error and quite another thing to say that one's opponent was dishonest. It was one thing to say that a church or a school system had policies based on poor judgment and quite a different thing to say that it was managed by rascals.

I suggested that partnership would prosper when the leadership of the private schools made its position clear on the following points:

1. That the public schools were necessary and respected institutions and that support for their improvement was a general public responsibility of all citizens.
2. That such terms as "secular" and "pragmatic," as applied to education, should be restored to their normal descriptive purposes, and that their use as vehicles of abuse be discontinued.
3. That, insofar as schools of any kind were responsible for the imperfections of our society and for evil behavior in general, such responsibility was shared by all schools, unless it could be shown that the graduates of private or of public schools were substantially more free of these particular faults than other persons.
4. That when school people disagreed—as they surely would—on some of the basic issues of human life, political theory, or edu-

cational policy, they endeavor to exchange evidence rather than epithets.

In suggesting such a self-denying ordinance to private school spokespersons, I hastened to add that their counterparts in the public school system should also refrain from such statements as:

1. That private schools were less democratic and less "American" than public schools.
2. That individual members of the Catholic Church invariably spoke for the Church as a whole.
3. That Catholics wished to destroy the American public school system.
4. That the misfortunes of public education were due to the hostile machinations of the Catholic clergy and hierarchy.

The Marquette speech was generously applauded, widely reprinted, and favorably received by the Catholic press. It is impossible, for me at least, to estimate reliably the influence that may have been exerted by an effort of this kind.

Soon after the Marquette celebration, I took another step of a very different kind in search of peace and quiet. I went to visit the Vatican. The decision to do so was entirely my own. I gave the visit no publicity whatever at the time, and I have not reported my visit at all until now. During two days in Rome I was able to talk with a series of prelates including the American priest who was then responsible for the relations between the Holy See and the United States. With him, as with others I met, I stressed the dangers of expanding controversy between his church and the organized teaching profession, the need for a reconsideration of Catholic policy on Federal aid to the public schools, and my own desire to avoid political acrimony. I thought that after these visits relationships improved, but I have no way to trace cause and effect. I was, and still am, aware of possible self-deception regarding the outcome.

Public opinion

In 1955 while I was in Cairo, Egypt, I received a trans-Atlantic telephone call from Dr. John K. Norton of Teachers College, Columbia University. He invited me to be one of the two speakers at a large public dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria, the opening event in the formal inauguration of Hollis Caswell as President of Teachers College.

I accepted the invitation and began at once to consider what topic I should choose and how I would develop it. More than thirty members of the NEA professional staff had received graduate education at T.C. and I was anxious to make a presentable statement.

After some reflection I decided to consider what I then believed would in the future become a crucial element in educational leadership: the role of citizens in educational policy. Accordingly, I called my speech, "The Rediscovery of the Citizen–an Opportunity for Educational Leadership." I consider that events demonstrate that, on this occasion at least, I made a valid prediction.

In the period which extended roughly from 1925 to 1955 the proper procedures for civic relationships in education seemed to have been finally settled. When I studied the theory of school administration under Dr. Cubberley at Stanford in the late twenties, we students learned to chart the correct relationships by drawing a series of rectangles, symmetrically arranged on the rectangular pages of our notebooks.

At the top of this chart we drew a small, sharp-edged rectangle representing the voting population of the community. These voters selected about seven of the most virtuous and sagacious of their fellow citizens to be members of their local school board. In this choice and chosen group, no self-promoters, no politicians, no axe-grinders, no hate-mongers, and above all no ex-teachers were to be included. This body of men (and women, if the women were *really* outstandingly competent) was installed in a larger rectangle just below that of the electorate.

The school board in turn (always following the most reliable procedures fully described in the textbook) selected a superintendent of schools. He–and 99 times out of 100, *he* it was–appeared in the largest rectangle of all, right in the middle of the chart. Above him, attached by a stout vertical line, floated the benign wisdom embodied in the board of education. Below him, in due proportion and seemly order, dangled the rectangles representing his professional staff–first a neat row of assistant superintendents in charge of this and that, then the school principals in their stately array, then the well-ordered rank and file of the classroom teachers. Below them, clinging precariously to the bottom edge of the chart, came the pupils.

These children, by the way, were the treasured offspring of some of the citizens represented at the opposite upper edge of the chart, but I do not remember that we ever drew even a dotted line, much less a solid one, to connect these parents with their progeny.

It was a lovely chart, enchanting in its tidy simplicity, as efficient as a packing plant. We would have called it "streamlined" if that useful word had been coined in time. No citizen could get to the superintendent except through the school board. No teacher could get to the school board except through the superintendent. It was a lofty view, like that from an airplane window, where every road seems a highway without bumps, every field free of rocks, every fence straight and in good repair.

Of course, we knew that our charts were not exactly true to reality. Our instructors brought it to our attention that school superintendents could have their terms terminated by means other than death or retirement. We even read in the newspapers that some school board members were rascals and we strongly suspected that not all of them were among Dr. Terman's top ten percent of the nation's intellectually gifted. Still, in our bright lexicon, there was no such word as "compromise." We knew quite infallibly that even though our charts might not coincide exactly with reality, they did represent the way things *ought* to be.

Ought to be; and would be, too, when we took our places in those big heavy-bordered, central rectangles and arranged matters properly. We were therefore willing, with the infinite patience and modesty of youth, to let the public schools muddle along for a few more years until we took over.

> "Bliss was it then to be alive,
> And to be young, was very Heaven."

So we continued to perfect our charts.

The difference between how the problem of governing public schools looked to the young student about 1925 and how the problem looked in 1955 may be ascribed in part to the abrasion of time upon the tender naiveté of youth. But something else also happened: the problem itself changed. Many powerful social and economic forces conspired to help make the difference.

Voluntary organizations have long been characteristic of the American scene. Alexis de Toqueville, early in the last century, devoted a whole chapter of his *Democracy in America* to making our "civil societies," as he called them, intelligible to his European readers. But the full flowering of voluntary organizations is an event of the middle decades of the twentieth century. Their variety, power, and prestige continue to grow.

All sorts of organized groups keep climbing over the fence of that little upper rectangle that we used to call the electorate. These groups often refuse to promote their aims merely by sharing in the election of school boards and legislatures. The American Legion, the Association for the United Nations, the National Safety Council, the Better Business Bureau, the American Federation of Labor, the Daughters of the American Revolution, and scores of others press their respective viewpoints about education. Sometimes they speak their collective opinions temperately, sometimes scurrilously, but always insistently. They organize contests, drives, collections, exhibits, special days, special weeks, and anniversaries that run all year long. They form caucuses and plan confrontations. They go to the courts; they go to the streets.

They demand that the public schools give more attention to – for instance: little league baseball; first aid; mental hygiene; speech correction; Spanish in the primary grades; military preparedness; international understanding; modern music; world history; black history; American history; local history; geography and homemaking; Canada and South America; the Arabs and the Israelis; the Turks and the Greeks; Christopher Columbus and Leif Erikson; Robert E. Lee and Woodrow Wilson; nutrition; care of the teeth; free enterprise; labor relations; cancer prevention; human relationships; atomic energy; the use of firearms; the Constitution; tobacco; temperance; kindness to animals; Esperanto; the 3 R's, the 3 C's, and the 4 F's; use of the typewriter and legible penmanship; moral values; physical fitness; ethical concepts; civil defense; religious literacy; thrift; law observance; consumer education; narcotics; mathematics; dramatics; physics; ceramics; and phonics.

Each of these groups is almost painfully anxious to avoid overloading the curriculum. All any of them ask is that the nonessentials be dropped in order to get their material in. Most of them insist that they do not want a special course–they just want their ideas to permeate the entire program for twelve years.

It is the uncontested privilege of American citizens to try to make education fit the needs of their society. Some of our most widely-accepted educational services originally entered the schools by this route. Somehow these pressures should be made part of an orderly process of school government.

At the time of the address, a new form of organization was entering the process of educational government, policy, and control. It was (and still is) called the Citizens Committee on Education. These local and state committees were then fostered by a National Citizens Committee for the Public Schools. That Committee has since undergone various changes in name and nature, but the movement remains.

Having thus described the changing role and style of civic participation in education, I concluded with a few suggestions. I believe that most of them still apply.

First, I suggested that some things cannot be settled by plebiscite. Water at sea level boils at 100 degrees Centigrade, even if twenty broadly representative citizens' committees vote unanimously and after full discussion that it doesn't. Knowledge and insight are not created in a conference room by the tap of the chairperson's gavel. The public schools need friends who possess not only a desire to improve them but also a willingness to give the time and to make the effort to get the facts. Alice in Wonderland was quite right, though every card in the deck was stacked against her, when she sharply told the King of Hearts that it was nonsense to consider the verdict before considering the evidence. A citizens' committee should be fact-finding before it is fault-finding.

There is no automatic virtue in public discussion which merely confronts one prejudice with its opposite. Experience and information are not handicaps to the drawing of correct conclusions. Nevertheless, a cult of discussion leadership has been developed in which informed and experienced persons are expected to preserve silence while those whose minds are untrammelled by knowledge are implored to express an opinion. An open mind is an excellent thing in man or woman, but it is not further improved by also being empty.

It is easy to see whether the school corridors are clean and where Roosevelt High stands in the basketball league. But other aspects of education are both more subtle and more vital. They cannot be understood by middle-aged men and women who look at education only through the deceptive mists of their own school-day memories. Because they remember too much that never happened, and forget too much that did happen, they expect too much that never will happen. Interest leaps quickly off the mark and tires easily; knowledge gets away to a slower start but it is a good companion for the long grind.

It is the duty of educational leadership not only to elicit public opinion but also to enlighten it. And the corollary is that the leader must be objective, a competent master of the relevant evidence, and completely honest in his or her endeavor to see that on school problems all the people have all the facts.

Second, I urged attention to the difference between advice and decision. In our zeal to take the public into partnership, we must avoid impossible complications in the task of those elected to public responsibility in education. There is a school board in every community, a legislature in every state capitol, a Congress in Washington. Good government requires that these agencies remain responsible to the people who elected them and to no other group. Neither a board of education nor a legislature may properly delegate its responsibility for decision.

It used to be said in those days (and I think I still hear it) that voluntary citizens' groups are more representative than a board of elected officials. This can never be true if the electorate and the elected perform their duties. Of course, a large, carefully-chosen committee may contain spokespersons for more minorities than a small elected body. But this is not representativeness; a good board of education is not a forum for conflicting minority opinions. The sound principle on which our local school boards rely is to represent all the people. On that point, I still think our student charts were correct.

Civic groups have the right and the duty to advise the board of education. To go further into the area of decision suggests only that the group has abused its function while the board has abdicated its authority.

Third, the recent emergence of healthy civic interest in education demands that we in education learn to take adverse comments in our stride.

Criticism, justified or not, is the irreducible price of civic interest and support. Those who expect citizens' committees to concern themselves solely with tax levies and bond issues for schools expect the impossible. These committees are bound to inquire what changes would make our schools better.

They cannot answer that question without considering what is wrong with the schools we now have. Their conclusions will sometimes be valid and sometimes unjust. We might as well face that fact. The complaint counter is going to be busy, but every merchant knows that a shortage of buyers is much worse than too many complaints.

If criticisms are offered in bad faith or on the basis of information widely known to be partial or false, the teaching profession will undoubtedly continue to make heated and defensive rejoinders. We have had plenty of opportunity to learn how to do that. We still have much to learn about how best to deal with honest and justifiable criticism. "He that wrestles with us," wrote Edmund Burke, "strengthens our nerves and sharpens our skill. Our antagonist is our helper."

Finally, I said, professional leadership in education will see an opportunity in the renaissance of wide public interest. The day of the school administrator who knew all the answers and asked all the questions is closing. Such persons served their profession and their country well, in their day and after their own fashion. They were often very skillful, exemplifying Talleyrand's cynical dictum that "diplomacy is the art of letting the other man have your way." Their staffs received clear-cut orders which relieved them of the pain and strain of independent thinking. They told the school board what was what, kept in close touch with the right people, put the foot down hard at every sign of change or trouble (the two words were synonyms to them), and ran school systems as smooth as a sidewalk puddle on a still day.

But the passing of these persons does not require a wild oscillation to the opposite extreme. The rising tide of civic interest in education deserves sterner stuff than the leader who never makes a decision that will displease anyone, who appoints committees for every detail, and will not declare whether the sun is shining without first counting the yeas and nays.

We say that the public schools belong to the public and that educational personnel are public servants. That is the truth and nothing but the truth, but it is not quite the whole truth. It would be more completely accurate to say that public education is a trusteeship, for a trustee may not do just as he or she will with the property involved. Teachers and school administrators are indeed the servants of the people, but not just of the people now living. They serve as well the heritage of the past and the promise of the future. An educational leader must observe the shifting tides of public opinion but he or she must steer by the rock of enduring truth.

The first-graders were telling their teacher how they helped at home. One said he dried the dishes, another put away her own toys, and so on. Tommy said nothing and when the teacher finally asked directly, "How do you help at home?" Tommy replied, with superb simplicity, "Well, mostly by keeping out of the way."

Educational leadership will do more than merely "keep out of the way" of the citizens' interest in their schools. It will evoke that interest, welcome it, inform it, challenge it when it seems mistaken, and guide it toward higher goals of achievement and public service. The old charts are worn out and prospective leaders of tomorrow need some new charts to ponder.

15 Federal School Legislation

The long road - Kennedy and Nixon in Congress - General Eisenhower - President-elect Eisenhower - President Eisenhower - The Commissioner of Education - The Secretary of HEW - Stevenson vs. Stassen - Oil for Education - The White House Conference - Action on the Conference findings - The second term of President Eisenhower - Cash for a crash program - New signs of leadership - The 1960 campaign, Kennedy and Nixon - John F. Kennedy and federal aid - The So-called Educational "Quality" Bill - Federal aid to higher education - The Rose Garden - L.B.J.: "Let us continue" - President Johnson at work - Evaluating the results - Celebrating a breakthrough.

Securing the assistance of the United States Government to improve the public schools had been an important objective of the National Education Association long before I became its Executive Secretary and indeed long before I joined its staff. In fact, in the very year it was founded (1857) the NEA urged Representative James A. Garfield to introduce a bill creating the agency now called the United States Office of Education.

The long road

My own first connections with the effort to secure federal support for education took the form of collecting relevant data in the NEA Research Division, promoting federal aid through the Joint Committee on the Emergency in Education, and writing avalanches of memoranda.

In the school year 1934-35, the subject for the national debate league was: "*Resolved,* That the Federal Government should adopt the policy of equalizing educational opportunity by means of annual grants to the several states for public elementary and secondary education." I wrote the brief for the affirmative in the official Debate Handbook and the same 32-page document was reprinted and widely distributed by the NEA.

My first appearance before a Congressional committee was a ghostly one. In other words, I drafted a statement to a Congressional committee for the use of Mr. James W. Crabtree, a former NEA Executive Secretary, before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor on February 16, 1931. I had then been a member of the NEA staff for a little more than one year. The drafting of such statements for delivery by Congresspersons and by various officers of the Association was a routine responsibility for me at that time. I kept a record of the first one; I must have prepared several dozen in all during the next few years. Mr. Crabtree really did not need my help. He had a knowledge and an eloquence in conveying his observations that made my efforts seem quite forced and unconvincing by comparison. Other people for whom I ghosted, however, were embarrassingly tongue-tied or irrelevant without help from me or someone else.

My first personal appearance before a Congressional committee occurred before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor in February 1937.

The subject under discussion was S.419, a bill "to promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the states and territories in providing more effective programs of public education." I was one of a team of witnesses assembled by the NEA for the four-day hearing. My particular function was to present evidence regarding the social and economic effects of deficiencies in educational opportunity. My discourse included references to crime (over 11 percent of prison inmates were totally illiterate; states with low education standards were also the states with high rates of homicide and other crimes); poverty (the Federal Emergency Relief Administration report in 1935 said that the lack of schooling of a large percentage of the heads of relief families appears to be one reason for their being on relief); and illness (there is a positive correlation between education and life expectancy). If time permitted, I said, I could engulf the Committee with statistics. I did not, however, carry out this aqueous threat but gave the Committee a large table showing the rankings of the states on six *education* factors (literacy, holding power of the schools, school attendance, average teachers' salaries, average value of school property per child, and expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance); *law observance* (number of homicides); four measures of *economic status* (relief, farm tenancy, retail sales per capita, and income per child five to twenty years of age); on *health* (infant mortality); and on three *general cultural* measures (newspaper circulation, number of telephones, per capita number of radio receivers).

In June 1943, I appeared briefly before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor to support S.B.1130, the "War-area Child-Care Act of 1943." Due largely to the war economy, many women were employed to offset the manpower shortage. The result was a demand for emergency legislation to provide care and education for the young children of mothers thus employed. Only by Congressional action, I said, could the country be made strong enough to win the war and wise enough to keep the peace. The legislation was not adopted by the Congress at that time. However, Congress did enact aid for constructing and operating schools in Federally Impacted Areas, Public Law 137, commonly known as the Lanham Act.

Kennedy and Nixon in Congress

During the administration of President Truman (1945-1952) an excellent bill providing federal aid to public schools was sponsored by Democratic Senator Lister Hill and Republican Senator Robert Taft. The "conversion" of Senator Robert Taft of Ohio from a position of steadfast opposition to federal participation in education to the active sponsorship of legislation for this purpose was an important event. "Mr. Republican," as Senator Taft was affectionately called during his service in the Senate, was a man of high principle. When he changed his opinion about federal aid to education the issue could no longer be dismissed as though it were solely a matter of political partisanship. The bi-partisan bill was easily passed by the United States Senate.

The proposal then moved to the House of Representatives where it was referred to the Committee on Education. This Committee failed to recommend the proposal by a vote of 13:12. Prior to that vote we had high hopes that somehow we could muster the one more vote needed to allow the Bill to be considered by the House. We hoped to gain support from among the younger members of the Committee. On the Republican side we sought the support of Representative Richard M. Nixon of California. On the Democratic side we put our hopes on Representative John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts. When the vote was taken Representatives Kennedy and Nixon both voted "Nay." That decision was enough, as it turned out, to stop the enactment of significant federal aid to education for nearly twenty years.

How changing times and circumstances modify judgments! As I shall describe in detail later, during his term in the Presidency John F. Kennedy labored hard but without success to secure just such legislation as he had helped as a young member of Congress to defeat. President Richard Nixon, on the other hand, did not become a President known for his sponsorship of constructive school legislation.

At the time I became Executive Secretary of the Association (August 1952) the presidential nominating conventions were being organized. The Democratic party named Adlai Stevenson as its standard bearer and the Republicans chose Dwight D. Eisenhower.

General Eisenhower

The previous autumn (September 11, 1951) I had talked with General Eisenhower at his NATO headquarters near Paris. The purpose of my visit was to discuss with the General a draft of a proposed report on Education and National Security by the Educational Policies Commission—a body of which General Eisenhower was still an active and interested member. He received me very cordially. I had been told not to remain more than twenty minutes but when I rose to leave at the end of that period, he insistently detained me for about ten minutes more with additional observations.

One of the points at issue was whether, under a system of universal military service for young men, there should be any exemption or postponement of the military service obligation for men selected to take advanced education. His reaction to any exceptions for such reasons was decidedly negative. The experience under the G.I. Bill of Rights was showing, he said, that the interruption of education was not necessarily detrimental. In fact, added maturity and experience were helpful. Those who had the ability and a genuine desire to obtain further education could get such education after two years in the armed forces.

Furthermore, he added, we should consider the morale of the young men involved. No matter how valid and impartial the tests of college aptitude might be, the man who fails to obtain a high grade will not ascribe his failure to his own deficiencies. He is likely to be resentful, to say that he was ill or worried on the day the tests were given, or that he would have done better if he had money to employ a tutor, or had more free time to study, or had attended a better school. And in some cases such an argument would be correct. Besides, most of the highly skilled occupations require extended preparation; we were not talking about deferment for a year or two; we were dealing with a deferment of four to seven years.

The draft report also proposed that the President of the United States should appoint a National Specialized Manpower Board to determine areas of human-power shortage, to establish screening procedures, and to have jurisdiction over the small number of young persons who because of unusual ability and drive should secure additional training in the public interest. To this, General Eisenhower was vigorously opposed. He was skeptical about the wisdom of placing so much power in the hands of an agency of the Federal Government and he gave from his own experience some illustrations of these dangers.

As I rose to leave he asked me to wait. Pacing his office while gently swinging a golf club, he reiterated that if the EPC Report gave any special consideration to educators the report would appear to the public to be biased, no matter how sincere and disinterested its sponsors might be. He wondered aloud whether it might be useful to arrange a small two-day conference of prominent citizens to evaluate this draft report and to assure them that, if they wished, that their pro and con arguments would be published along with the Commission's recommendations. He gave me a list of seven names to illustrate the kind of people of sound loyalty and judgment who might be invited to such a meeting.

As I left I remarked that we missed General Eisenhower at the meetings of the Educational Policies Commission and that we all hoped to see him at meetings in the future. He replied instantly that we could not possibly miss him as much as he missed the contacts with the Commission and with American education in general. He said he hoped that his current assignment abroad would soon be completed so that he could return home to work in the field of education. I left with no doubt whatever of his complete sincerity of purpose on this point.

As late as November 19, 1951 General Eisenhower read a revised draft of the EPC document on "Education and National Security" and sent me a signed official ballot approving its publication. On the returned manuscript he wrote:

> Dear Mr. Carr–I've been able to read *only* the first chapter. It is *fine*! My few suggestions are in the form of scrawled notes in margins, etc. Sorry I could not get over whole thing–but I'm just pushed too hard. I'm doing this on my plane–now I'm landing at Rome–
>
> Eisenhower

What happened to lead General Eisenhower to respond to the call of the Republican party I have no idea. That he did change his mind about remaining active in education is obvious. Whether his election to the Presidency made more difficult the provision of federal funds to improve the public schools is hardly debatable. With all of his sincere devotion to educational development, President Eisenhower could not be persuaded to allow that devotion to be expressed in national fiscal policy.

President-elect Eisenhower

In December 1952 a small delegation from the National Education Association called on President-elect Eisenhower in his New York hotel office. We reminded him of the recurring financial crises in the public schools. General Eisenhower was, of course, familiar with this situation through his membership on the Educational Policies Commission.

We pointed out that Public Law 815, which provided federal funds for schools in communities heavily impacted by federal defense and other activities, would expire in June 1953. We urged the President-elect to bring about a renewal of that act in order to gain time for more comprehensive evaluations. We argued that schools in the federally-impacted areas were not the only ones that needed prompt assistance. We pointed out that, as long as the high post-war birthrates continued, the United States would need some 90,000 new teachers annually and that only 32,000 new teachers a year were being graduated from all of the nation's teacher-preparation programs. We received from General Eisenhower an attentive and friendly, but non-committal, hearing.

President Eisenhower

After President Eisenhower's inauguration, Washington correspondents, drawing on the ubiquitous "reliable sources," indicated that the President's first State of the Union Message, which was then being put together for him, might omit all mention of education. On December 31, 1953, I reminded the President of his interview with the NEA delegation and informed him that conditions affecting public education had not improved. I suggested that in the messages which he would soon send to outline the future policy of his Administration, he should stress the needs of the educational system.

The President's message did mention the needs of education, contrary to the "reliable sources." The President said that the nation as a whole was not preparing teachers or building schools fast enough. He set aside the preparation of teachers as a state and local responsibility, but asserted that the Federal Government should assist states which demonstrably could not provide sufficient school buildings. In order to appraise the extent of the need he announced that a Conference on Education should be held in each state. The state conferences would culminate in a National Conference so that every level of government could gain the information with which to attack the problem.

We were all pleased that education was mentioned at all but somewhat disappointed by the narrow range of this declaration. Our suggestion to him in December that he make a fresh evaluation of school needs did not envisage a complicated series of state and national conferences with their inevitable delays. Nevertheless, as often happens in congressional and federal relations, it was deemed advisable to welcome the message. My press statement pledged NEA support for the state and national conferences on education but added that, since most of the needed information had already been assembled, prompt action in holding these conferences would be possible. The President's public recognition of the threat to the education of youth because of the shortage of teachers and school buildings was a timely reminder to Congress and the public. I said that legislation already before the Congress would, if promptly enacted, give effect to the President's recommendation that the Federal Government assist the states in school construction. Parallel legislation to reduce the shortage of teachers should also be enacted, since the need for teachers had been equally well established and the education of children could not be postponed. I concluded by saying that the National Education Association, by resolution, was in full support of the President's declarations for the United Nations, for statehood for Hawaii, and for lowering the voting age to 18.

The President's budget message appeared soon thereafter. It contained nothing to brighten the rather gloomy outlook. The President recognized the importance of education and the need for action but said, "I do not accept the simple remedy of federal intervention." The day after the budget message was delivered I received a letter from the President. He pointed out that he had recognized the importance of education in two major messages to Congress and added an expression of his appreciation "for the splendid work being done by your organization both within and outside of the profession in mobilizing the resources of the nation for the improvement of education."

The educational policy of the new President thus became clear in the first few months of his Administration. There were two parts to this policy. First, President Eisenhower rarely missed an opportunity to speak with unquestionable conviction on the importance he attached to education. Second, the policy required the absolute minimum possible involvement of the Federal Government, particularly when federal funds might be required.

The second half of this policy was first evidenced by the President's appointments for administrative and investigative activities in which educational programs might be involved. He named Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby to be Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. He named Dean Clarence Mannion of the Notre Dame University Law School to be head of a special commission to study and report on federal-state relations. Dean Mannion was widely known for his speeches and articles against federal participation in education. Mrs. Hobby, although less widely known on this issue, soon showed her enthusiastic agreement with that point of view.

The Commissioner of Education

The new Administration began by cutting the budget for the United States Office of Education. The Commissioner of Education, Earl McGrath, protested that the Office could not cope with its responsibilities under the law if its budget were cut to this extent. Early in 1954, Commissioner McGrath was told by the new HEW Secretary to appear before a Senate committee and to testify in favor of the reduced budget. Unable to secure any change in these instructions, Commissioner McGrath wrote out his resignation and left it in the hands of the guard at the front door of the White House grounds. He and I had discussed his predicament several times before his resignation. I feel that he took the only proper course of action that was open to him.

The Administration ultimately filled the vacant post of Commissioner of Education by appointing Samuel Brownell, Superintendent of Schools in Grosse Point, Michigan, and younger brother of the new Attorney-General, Herbert Brownell. The new Commissioner supported Administration policy faithfully.

The Secretary of HEW

When Secretary Hobby, as the first witness before the Senate Committee, formally put forth the Administration's official new program for education, it was called "a powerful three-pronged weapon" against the ills of education. The three prongs were:

1. State and national conferences on education
2. Creation of a National Advisory Committee on Education
3. A bill authorizing cooperative research in education

Commissioner of Education Brownell supported Mrs. Hobby by presenting in chart form the major problems of education which these three measures were supposed to alleviate.

Somewhat later, in April 1954, I had my own turn to testify. I said bluntly that the Administration program of conferences and advisory committees and cooperative research, even if all three were enacted, could not cope with the immediate needs of the schools. None of the proposed three prongs could keep another million children from entering our schools each year for at least the next five years.

On the proposed conferences, I urged that they deal with the educational problems of the next decade. As for today's urgent needs, the facts were already fully available. I pointed out that since 1929 we had "enjoyed" seven federally-sponsored national conferences or advisory committees on education and that six more such major activities had been sponsored by private groups. The nation's schools do not, I said, need more conferences to find the facts; they need a government that will face the facts already assembled. The Administration's proposals for more conferences and studies were nevertheless adopted.

The next month, May 1954, I was the lead-off witness in a series arranged by the NEA to inform the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on the need for federal funds for school building construction. Three bills on this subject (S.359, S.2601, and S.2779) had been introduced and referred to the Subcommittee. The Administration, having already limited itself to the conference-advisory committee-cooperative research program set forth in the State of the Union address, gave no support at all to these measures. They were ultimately reported to the Senate but repeatedly by-passed until the 83rd Congress adjourned. It seems unnecessary to report here the well-worn facts and rationale behind the proposal. We knew and could prove that the school housing shortage had been twenty years in the making, that one out of every five schools in the nation had become outmoded, unsafe, or obsolete. I used President Eisenhower's words—"Our schools need some prompt effective help" for all they were worth. I showed that serious trouble was surely ahead in our inner cities if their school buildings were not speedily improved. If in 1954 we could have had from President Eisenhower or Vice-President Nixon, the same support for federal school construction as they gave post-Sputnik in 1957, many things might have been different. But in 1954 the Administration answer was still No . . . no . . . no.

As the year wore on, the NEA relationship with Secretary Hobby did not improve.

On July 19, 1954, Miss Waurine Walker of the Texas Education Agency who had just been elected NEA President, came by appointment to Washington to seek Administration support for the pending emergency school construction bill. Earlier in the day Miss Walker had told reporters, "I am in Washington today to make a personal appeal to my fellow Texan (Secretary Hobby) to give her official approval to the emergency aid for school construction bills." Upon arrival at the Secretary's office Miss Walker was told that Mrs. Hobby "unexpectedly had been called to the Capitol."

Who called her? For what reason? When would she return? To questions such as these no information was given. Miss Walker, like a gracious Southern lady, showed no sign of resentment. But, because of the slight to the NEA, I will admit that I was furious.

Hoping still for a little Presidential encouragement, our friends in Congress kept up the battle for the legislation to the end. The School Construction Bill was passed by the Senate, but the White House ignored the issue and in the end the legislation failed.

Before that, however, in May 1955, the time came for me to face the Committee on Education in the House of Representatives which was considering about twenty bills dealing with school construction. The substance of my testimony there was the same as given previously before the comparable Senate Committee. There is no need to reiterate that argument.

However, I was becoming more clearly aware that time was passing and that several hundred thousand young people would be in crowded, decrepit, or obsolete schools next year unless the Congressional pace were quickened. I pushed the need for prompt action as hard as I could. The Administration spokespersons had recently reduced their estimates of the school building shortage and were now saying that "only" 176,000 classrooms were needed. This was statistical legerdemain at its airiest height and that word "only" particularly infuriated me. So I closed by saying that the Committee could not at one blow eliminate all the roadblocks to good education for all. "But," I concluded, "because you cannot do everything you need not be content to do nothing. We really need not wait placidly for another four or five years to reduce the classroom deficit to a point where "only" five million children are affected." We lost the school construction bill in the House of Representatives, 224 to 194. We were 16 votes short—less than 4 percent of a total of 418 votes cast. It could have been passed in the Senate but there was no need for us to call on our friends in the Senate for another effort that was doomed to be unproductive.

Stevenson versus Stassen

At the NEA Convention in Chicago in July 1955, both President Eisenhower and Adlai Stevenson were invited to speak at general sessions. The President sent us a telegram and one of his special assistants, Harold E. Stassen. Mr. Stevenson came in person, although he was suffering from a very serious, almost disabling, cold. With devastating effect he quoted from President Eisenhower's first special message on education, "Our school system demands some prompt effective help." Two and a half years later no help had been provided and we were awaiting a Conference on Education to be held about six months in the future. He was equally scornful of the President's interim proposals as recommended to Congress in February. The President had said the nation needed $7 billion worth of new schools. But to help get them, he recommended that Congress pass "not a law but a miracle"–33 cents a year to meet every $35.00 of admittedly urgent need. Mr. Stevenson went on to advocate very persuasively the merits of the existing NEA policy on federal aid to education. He closed with a plea that teachers make sure that "mass education shall not become education for mediocrity." He received an enthusiastic standing ovation.

The next evening Harold Stassen, speaking for President Eisenhower, addressed the Assembly. He spoke on "The Search for Peace," and he discussed education for less than a fifth of his time at the podium. He characterized Mr. Stevenson as "one of the most clever speakers in our country" who had "in a sly and smooth manner" implied, he said, that President Eisenhower had been more interested in roads and military reserves than in children and teachers. He had never known, said Mr. Stassen, a man more interested in education than Dwight Eisenhower or a woman more effectively representing the interests of education than Mrs. Hobby. He deplored "politicians sniping at the President of the United States, as he steadily builds the foundations for peace." The audience gave Mr. Stassen standing applause also but it was, in my judgment, a perfunctory gesture to the spokesperson for our President, rather than for what he said.

In the early 1950's I was able to strengthen considerably the staff of the Legislative and Federal Relations Division of the National Education Association, and to take some other steps toward a greater unity in the teaching profession with regard to the various detailed issues involved in federal school legislation. It was clear, however, that under the administration of President Eisenhower there would be no rapid or massive infusion of federal funds into the educational system.

Oil for Education

Meanwhile, a new possibility of securing more funds for education appeared. In April and May 1953 a prolonged debate took place in Congress regarding jurisdiction over the resources beneath the coastal waters of the United States. The constitutional and legal issues were complex and the course of the debate was labyrinthine. School people were interested in the discussion because of the suggestion that the yield from some or all of these resources be set aside for public education. The NEA took no stand at all on the jurisdictional dispute—did the submarine lands belong to the coastal states or to the United States?

The law that was finally enacted by Congress assigned the ownership of the "submerged lands within the historic boundaries" to each of the coastal states. In signing the law, President Eisenhower emphasized the words "historic boundaries." The United States was not, he said, relinquishing its rights to submerged lands on the Continental Shelf which, in most cases, extends far beyond the outermost boundaries claimed by the states.

Further legislation was then introduced affirming the federal ownership of submerged land beyond the historic boundaries of the states. Senator Lister Hill of Alabama then offered an amendment assigning the proceeds from these national submarine lands to the support of education. The jurisdictional question being thus settled, the NEA could support the Hill Amendment. Testifying before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in May 1953, I pointed out the strain on schools caused by the rapidly rising enrollments in the elementary schools, the probability that these increases would continue, and that the postwar wave of additional enrollments would sweep on year by year into the high schools and colleges. I pointed out that the nation was already short of classrooms.

This was the first of about thirty appearances before Congressional committees as Executive Secretary of the NEA. It would be a pleasure to write that my first try electrified the Congress and that the Oil-for-Education amendment was adopted forthwith.

Unfortunately, the amendment was derailed. The Oil-for-Education amendment, if enacted, would have made an immense improvement in school finance in this country.

On May 24 the Oil-for-Education amendment was approved by the Senate by a vote of 47 to 35. The House of Representatives did not adopt a similar amendment and the House Conferees would not agree to the Senate amendment. On July 30, 1953, the Senate agreed 45 to 43 to pass the bill without the Oil-for-Education amendment. The NEA went all-out to retain the amendment but the Association did not have the necessary political clout.

The White House Conference

The White House Conference on Education was held, as the President had proposed, with a ratio of about one to two between the educators and other citizens in attendance. The four-day meeting began November 28, 1955.

The Conference itself was undoubtedly the nation's most ambitious effort to conduct a broad civic inventory of its schools. The Conference had been nearly two years in the planning stage, a process which involved thousands of preparatory local, state, and regional conferences. President Eisenhower had appointed Neil McElroy of Cincinnati to head a national committee to direct the Conference. Congress had appropriated nearly a million dollars to finance the enterprise. Six broad issues were defined for the Conference discussion:

1. What the schools should accomplish
2. How to organize school systems
3. School building needs
4. Keeping enough good teachers
5. Financing the schools
6. Creating public interest in education

The six topics are listed above in the same order as they would be considered at the Conference. As will be shown later, this sequence was rather important.

Before these six items were made public, rumors circulated that the National Conference Committee would not include financial questions on the agenda on the amazing grounds that the financing of education was a purely local and state matter in which a national conference should not intervene.

About a week before the Conference met I spoke at the inauguration of Hollis Caswell as President of Teachers College, Columbia University. I took the occasion to predict that if the White House Conference on Education merely reiterated the importance of good schools and declared, in effect, a national emergency in education, it would fall short of what the President had said he wanted in proposing the Conference, and short of what Congress had envisaged when it voted the funds to finance it. I noted that only one-sixth of the Conference advance agenda was allocated to school finance. If, I said, the Conference devotes most of even this limited attention to local and state finance and thus fails to consider a program of financial action for schools by the Federal Government, it will fail to reach its proper responsibilities and its potential achievements.

When the Conference assembled, it was opened by a five-minute film of President Eisenhower at his farm in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania. The opening speech was made by Vice-President Nixon who said, among other things, that teachers' salaries "are nothing short of a national disgrace and if the situation is not corrected it could lead to a national disaster." He did not, of course, suggest that the Federal Government accept responsibility for providing funds to remove the disgrace and avert the disaster.

President Eisenhower did not appear in person at any stage of the Conference.

The method of conducting the Conference was not merely unusual; it was, as far as I know, unique. It was a bold and on the whole a successful effort to give maximum opportunity for the delegates to participate. The delegates to the Conference were selected, with only a few exceptions, by each of the State Conference Committees with the advice and approval of the Governors. In addition, 300 invitations were issued to national organizations, both lay and professional. One hundred invitations were offered to members of the Congress who had special interest or responsibilities in education. A few special guests and foreign observers were invited. The number of delegates allotted to each state was roughly proportionate to its population. Thus, California, New York, and Pennsylvania had delegations of 98, 123, and 86 respectively. No state had fewer than ten delegates.

The states were asked to name delegations in which educators would be outnumbered by other citizens by a two-to-one ratio and this ratio was maintained throughout the Conference.

Leaving aside occasional speeches, the basic mechanism of the Conference operated as follows:

1. There were 180 simultaneous round-table meetings, with approximately 11 delegates at each table. Each table prepared a brief written report.
2. The 180 table chairpersons took their written reports to 18 tables of ten each. Each of these 18 tables drafted the best synthesis it could and elected a chairperson to represent it at the next level.
3. The 18 table chairpersons, each bringing a written report from his or her group, then met in two groups of nine each; each of the two groups elected a chairperson and drafted a report summarizing its chief conclusions.
4. The two elected chairpersons met to combine their two reports in a single conference statement.

This four-step process was applied separately and in turn to each of the six major topics of the Conference as listed above.

The original 180 tables were composed by chance but in such a way that the ratio of educators to lay persons at each table would reflect the overall recommended ratio of one-to-two.

The delegate cards were completely reshuffled after each topic so that every delegate would be in a different group for the initial discussion of each of the six Conference topics.

The 180 chairpersons for the first topic only, "What the Schools Should Accomplish," were named by the Conference administration. Thereafter all the chairpersons were elected by the small groups to which they belonged.

There was no Committee on Resolutions and, indeed, there were no Conference resolutions at all, nor any voting by the Conference as a whole. Some delegates were critical of the absence of floor debates on formal resolutions. In retrospect I think the outcome of the Conference was not adversely affected by the lack of this traditional procedure. There can be no doubt that the Conference gave the individual delegate, "the little fellow," a far better chance to state and to argue his or her opinions than the more traditional style.

On the night before the Conference opened I called a meeting of about 60 NEA members who were identified in the various state delegations. The first order of our business was a systematic review in the light of NEA policy of the six announced issues on the Conference agenda. The second item was a careful explanation of the operating method that the Conference would follow. Third, NEA members who were especially knowledgeable were asked to exert as much leadership as they could in the discussion of the issues on which they were best informed. Delegates who had a strong interest and experience in school finance were asked to note that this topic would not be considered until nearly the end of the Conference. They would do well, therefore, to decline suggestions that they serve as chairpersons for topics which appeared earlier on the agenda.

The idea that influence upon the Conference findings could be exerted by a planned use of the Conference procedure was not a monopoly of the National Education Association. Several other groups of delegates tried to influence the Conference outcomes in this way, but I believe the NEA members were the most successful. In spite of organized efforts by some delegates to keep school people out of the chairs of the school finance topic, the two chairpersons who emerged from the process were well-known leaders favorable to federal aid for the schools.

A substantial majority of the Conference concluded that the states lacked the fiscal resources to meet the essential needs of the schools. By a ratio of better than two-to-one the participants approved the idea that the national government should increase its financial participation in public education. A small minority, opposed to federal aid in any form, was genuinely shocked, surprised and grieved by this outcome.

A large majority of delegates opposed the use of tax funds for private schools while a smaller majority favored the availability and use of tax funds for health and welfare benefits to the children enrolled in private schools.

Action on the Conference findings

The final reports of the Conference were next sifted through the 34-member Committee on the White House Conference on Education. The relatively crisp Conference findings were somewhat wilted in the process. Thus, on school finance, although the Committee did make headlines by declaring that the expenditures for education should be doubled within the next decade, it added coyly that "The exact sources of the necessary funds will be determined more easily when there is more public agreement that the funds must be provided . . . Money for schools must continue to come from all three levels of government, with a portion of funds for school buildings being made available by the federal government on an emergency basis." The Committee thus almost ignored the clear recommendations of the Conference. Indeed, two members of the Committee insisted on submitting a minority report, centering their objections on the narrow scope and evasiveness of the Committee text. I myself pointed out publicly that the Committee's report to the President on federal financing was a faithful reflection of what the President had already recommended to the Congress. After months of public discussion and substantial expenditures of funds and time, the President had heard only an echo of his own voice. The House Rules Committee was at that time holding up a bill for exactly such temporary emergency aid for school construction. Its passage, in my opinion, could have been promptly assured by one firm word from the White House. That word was never spoken.

Although the logical outcome of the Conference was thus thwarted, the Conference was not a total failure. Although its recommendations on federal aid were first grievously diluted by the White House Conference Committee and then largely ignored by the Administration and the Congress, there were several constructive outcomes.

First, the Conference did endorse strongly the major current legislative objective of the NEA.

Second, the citizens at the Conference demanded a broad-gauge program of education. The occasional call to restrict the school system to the three R's and college preparation commanded no general assent. Indeed, the Conference called for full recognition of such aspects of education as the arts, citizenship, human relations, world understanding, and health and the best possible adaptation of these services to both handicapped and gifted youth.

Third, the Conference disclosed a well-balanced public understanding of both the achievements and the limitations of American education. It did not join in the anvil chorus of the critics who condemn everything the schools do, the books they use, the subjects they offer, the teaching methods they apply. The Conference showed ability to balance good and bad aspects of education, regarded better teachers as the key to good schools, and gave its most sustained applause to Vice-President Nixon's declaration that teachers' salaries were "a national disgrace."

Finally, the Conference quickly developed a cordial *entente* between the approximately 600 educators present and the approximately 1,200 other citizens. The educators did not, as some had feared, dominate the Conference. The six chairpersons elected by the delegates for each of the six major themes included a public utility executive, a PTA leader, an engineering consultant, a state superintendent of public instruction, and two civic leaders not professionally engaged in school work. Three of the six chairpersons were women.

The education record of Congress in President Eisenhower's first term, moreover, was not entirely blank. Legislation was enacted to develop public library services in rural areas, to continue the policy of federal financial assistance for the construction and operation of schools in the federally impacted areas, to extend the educational benefits offered to veterans of World War II to veterans of the "police action" in Korea, and to extend the book postal rates to include 16mm educational films. It is estimated that the postal rate change saved teachers and other users of such visual teaching aids about $3.5 million a year.

The second term of President Eisenhower

The remainder of the eight Eisenhower years in the Presidency, with one exception which will be described later, were not productive in terms of school legislation.

When the Congress assembled after the November 1954 Congressional elections, President Eisenhower announced that he would send to Congress a special message on education on February 15. As on previous occasions of this kind, the President spoke of "the undeniable importance of free education to a free way of life," declared a state of emergency ("Millions of children still attend schools which are unsafe or which permit learning only parttime or under conditions of serious overcrowding."), and announced that the federal government should "step forward to join with the states and communities." None of these statements could be called "news" but it was helpful to have them reaffirmed with the great prestige of the President and the Presidential office behind them.

But again the proposed action was not proportional to the introductory rhetoric. The Administration's Bill, S.968, was prepared without consultation with the professional or civic organizations most concerned. Its preamble stated that its purpose was "to provide assistance of a substantial and effective nature." Its provisions simply failed to live up to the advance billing. The newspapers, with their usual demand for simplicity at all costs, seized on a few phrases in Mrs. Hobby's press release and headlined the measure as the Seven Billion Dollar Federal School Program. This was monumentally inaccurate. The proposed federal grants, if enacted, would reduce the classroom deficit by 0.8 percent per year for each of the next three years. S.968 would leave the burden of school construction exactly where it had been—on the local home and real estate owner and on such supplementary sources as could be made available by the states.

It was upon S.968 that on February 17, 1955, I had to direct the most withering fire I could command.

The highest possible amount that the Federal Government would contribute was about $70 million a year, or $210 million for the three years that the law would operate. Thus in three years the Federal Government would finance the replacement of slightly over 2 percent of the shortage. Nearly 98 percent of the rest of the cost would have to come from the states and localities. Even when some federal funds could be provided, an enormous amount of federal control would have to be accepted by the recipient states and local school systems. I announced that unless these controls were removed from the bill and unless some genuine help was provided, the National Education Association would oppose the Administration's suggestions and support legislation of the type that such Senators as Robert Taft, John Cooper, Elbert Thomas, and Lister Hill had consistently proposed.

"Disappointment" seemed to be the most kindly word that could be used to describe the reaction to S.968 of teachers, hard-pressed school board members, and anxious parents. I heard a number of more picturesque descriptions.

Testifying for the Administration Bill and against the NEA-backed proposals for substantial action were the taxpayers' associations, state chambers of commerce, and other representatives of organized business from Connecticut, Indiana, West Virginia, Louisiana, California, New Mexico, New Jersey, and Nebraska. With remarkable unanimity these witnesses informed the Congress that federal aid was not necessary, that the shortages were imaginary or exaggerated, and that local and state efforts could and would support the schools properly. I wondered how many of these organizations had acted vigorously to secure support for schools in their own states and communities. I looked up the record on as many of them as I could. As a rule, the louder they shouted in Washington against federal aid, the softer they talked about the need for state support in their state capitols. As a rule they opposed state school legislation, then hurried off to Washington to assure Congress that the states could handle the job alone, and then in some cases flew home just in time to vote "NO" on local school revenue proposals.

I myself never doubted that the people of the United States were prepared to pay for excellent schools and that ultimately the Congress would enact strong federal aid legislation. I believed that what is right in principle would ultimately prevail. Whatever vicissitudes lay ahead would be temporary and reversible, as the same force that draws the tide to its lowest ebb will in due time bring it crashing back upon the shore.

My nagging worry was not *whether,* but *when.* Would federal aid for public education come too late? The U.S. Chamber of Commerce had a Committee on Education which, from time to time, invited me to meet with them and sometimes with larger groups which they arranged. My usual theme, at their request, was federal support for education. They probably grew very weary of hearing me identify the same needs and press for similar solutions year after year. When I informed them about the miserable school conditions in the urban and rural slums they doubtless thought gratefully of the neat, attractive suburban public schools in which their children and grandchildren were being taught. When I told them that the nation's teachers and many other citizens were becoming increasingly impatient to discover that the most prosperous nation on earth was failing to offer a good education to all its children, these persons probably thought, "He's trying to scare us." When I said that trade union affiliation and tactics as well as various forms of extreme militancy were growing in favor among the rank and file of the teaching profession, they smiled in polite incredulity.

Of all sad words that come and go,
The saddest are these—"I told them so."

Cash for a crash program

In October 1957, about one year after the White House Conference on Education had made its report and both the Administration and the Congress had ignored it, the Soviet Union launched its first Sputnik. Swift and vindictive was the ensuing search in the United States for a scapegoat for our national sin, if sin it was, to allow our country to be embarrassed in this respect. There was no serious criticism of the Pentagon or of the White House. There was no criticism of the rocket manufacturers or of the universities. The publicity empire represented by *Life, Time,* and *Fortune* and most of the rest of the press leaped eagerly to the verdict, long before the evidence could be examined, that our primary and secondary schools were responsible for the brief period of months when a satellite marked by the hammer-and-sickle circled through space all alone.

In the post-Sputnik winter of discontent, one of the minor but infuriating charges against American schools was the allegation that they failed to develop intellectual and rational powers. Whenever a citizen of another country was awarded a Nobel Prize, we would be told that American education did not prepare youth for intellectual distinction. To evaluate this charge I studied the nationality of Nobel Prize laureates in the 57 years since the inception of the Prize. With only 6 percent of the world's population, the United States since 1900 had won 22 percent of all the Nobel Prizes in every field–physics, chemistry, medicine, literature, and peace. Moreover, for the ten pre-Sputnik years (1948-1957) the United States laureates took 41 percent of all the Nobel awards. Thus the United States' proportionate share in supplying Nobel winners was both large and increasing. More recently, a UNESCO report (*Courier,* July 1976, p. 10) shows that Americans won 26 percent of all Nobel awards between 1901 and 1974.

The Congressional reaction to the Russian performance was as hasty and ill-advised as its previous reaction to carefully considered and documented recommendations had been lethargic and indifferent. Less than a year after Sputnik I inaugurated the Space Age, Congress enacted the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958. It provided funds which were wholly inadequate to the reformation of American education. Furthermore, the Act had the serious flaw of using federal funds to determine state and local educational policy. Congresspersons and other public officials who had for years been opposing NEA policy with the allegation that it would bring "federal control" of education, now spun their position full circle like the artificial satellite to which their legislation was responding. They wrote and enacted a law which said in effect to local and state school authorities, "You may think you know what is best for your schools; you may think you need improved instruction in primary school reading or better school health services, but we in Washington know what you need better than you do. You need more attention to science, mathematics, and foreign languages. If you agree with us we will let you use some of your own tax money to improve your school program in these approved areas. If you fail to agree with us, we will not only exclude you from the benefits of the Act, but we will also use part of your tax payments to finance education in those school districts which do agree with us."

In spite of these serious defects the legislation received NEA support and was claimed by us as an achievement. After all, it did provide some federal funds for some aspects of secondary education. We hoped too, and history has shown that the hope was reasonable, that the areas of education covered by NDEA could be expanded in future years. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare said that there would have been no National Defense Education Act without the work of the National Education Association.

In 1959 the political preparations for the nominating conventions to name candidates for the national elections of 1960 began to appear. New York Governor Nelson Rockefeller, who had been Undersecretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the Cabinet of President Eisenhower, devoted one of his major pre-campaign addresses to education. He proposed an extremely limited program of federal support for school construction, and then only upon rigorous proof of poverty. This was in general his point of view when he was in the Eisenhower Cabinet. I wrote Governor Rockefeller, urging him to reconsider the problem and his position on it. I said that solutions which seemed acceptable in 1954 and 1955 might not now be adequate to the nation's needs. I believed the American people were ready for a more active role in education than their government had yet assumed and that this role should take the form of grants to be used by the states as they thought best for teaching or for the construction of buildings. I reminded him that the White House Conference on Education and many other important civic groups had declared that expenditures on public education should be doubled, and I pointed out that there was no realistic possibility of doubling the support of American education unless the taxing powers of the national government were utilized.

New Signs of Leadership

The Centennial Year of the National Education Association was 1957. In that period we came very close to securing the enactment of federal aid legislation.

Some changes in government personnel were helpful at that time. Mr. Marion Folsom was named Secretary of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department on August 1, 1955. The Secretary in turn named Lawrence Derthick as the new United States Commissioner of Education in December 1956.

The year began with more messages on education from the White House to the Congress. Thirty-six national organizations joined the NEA in a loose coalition to enact the pending school construction bill. The most open opposition on this occasion came as usual from the United States Chamber of Commerce. The Chamber argued that the nation did not really need very many new schools and that local and state resources were sufficient to fill any need that might be discovered. It cited its own statistics and computations to "prove" the point. We discovered right then that we really did have new leadership for education in the Federal Government. On March 11, 1957, HEW Secretary Folsom publicly rebuked the Chamber of Commerce for incorrectly juggling the data to minimize school construction needs. For years the Chamber of Commerce had enjoyed virtual federal immunity from such challenges. The White House Conference on Education, at which American business had been very well represented, had voted about two to one for federal school construction legislation. It was no secret that the Chamber of Commerce had done its utmost to prevent that conclusion.

When its campaign on this front ended in a disastrous and well-deserved defeat, the Chamber refused to accept the verdict, cast doubt on the integrity of the White House Conference, and mounted a vast, well-financed campaign to prevent congressional response. In spite of these efforts, public opinion in favor of federal action had shifted up from three to one to four to one.

Commissioner Derthick on February 6, 1957, had shown at congressional hearings that the classroom shortage was real and was injuring the education of children by overcrowded classrooms, half-day sessions, increased nervous tensions among teachers, aggravated school discipline problems, lower achievement standards, and increased difficulty in recruiting the needed new teachers.

The Chamber of Commerce ignored or minimized the tremendous backlog of classroom shortages accumulated during the Depression, World War II, and the Korean War; it overlooked the fact that just to replace obsolete, unsuitable, and unsafe classrooms would require about 17,000 new classrooms every year; it took no account of the overcrowding in existing schools. The number of pupils in excess of building capacity amounted to some 2.4 million in 1956. I suggested that these overcrowded and doubled session schools be designated Chamber of Commerce Schools in honor of the organization which had done so much to keep them in use.

Yet it began to appear that the federal school construction bill was almost sure to fail. It was caught in a general economy-in-government wave. Things began to change when Secretary Folsom directly refuted the spurious statistics of the Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Folsom followed up this public rebuke with congressional testimony far more powerful and committed than any we had been hearing lately from Administration spokespersons. Secretary Folsom also secured a White House promise that President Eisenhower would appear and speak at the NEA Centennial dinner on April 4.

When the plans for the dinner were more advanced, it became clear that the President was going to use this occasion for a major policy announcement on education. His eagerly awaited remarks were carried by the major TV and radio networks. In nearly 2,500 cities and towns, NEA affiliates arranged local NEA Centennial Celebrations to coincide with the event in Washington, including the President's address by TV or radio.

The Secret Service made many demands on me in connection with the President's appearance at the dinner. Among other things I was responsible for distributing several seating places at the tables in the front rows near the dais. I was also told that I should personally meet the President at a certain side door of the hotel and accompany him to a small V.I.P. room near the stage and remain with him a few minutes until it was time to escort him to the platform.

The Dwight Eisenhower I met on this occasion was a different person from the man who had attended Educational Policies Commission meetings, with whom I had talked at NATO headquarters near Paris, or the President-elect with whom our group had talked at his offices in the Commodore Hotel. This new Eisenhower was very tired. He had spent two hours at a National Security Council meeting that morning, had a talk with Henry Ford II (topic unannounced), met with the heads of the Housing and Finance Agency and of the Budget Bureau, and spent most of the afternoon talking (foreign policy, I assume) with the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles. It was now almost eight o'clock and he had one more difficult job to do. He asked me no questions; he appeared to be interested in neither serious conversation nor small talk. I think he was just resting. Fortunately for my own peace of mind, our wait in the V.I.P. room was brief–not more than five minutes.

Someone opened the door between us and the dais, we walked out, the TV floodlights came on, the band struck up "Hail to the Chief." I ushered the President to his seat on the stage and introduced the NEA President, Miss Martha Shull, to him. The crowd was on its feet wildly applauding. In the few moments of transition from the V.I.P. room to the podium I could literally *see* the President gain strength and refreshment. The wide enduringly-boyish grin lighted his face, his eyes sparkled, his two arms shot straight up in greeting. He then gave his speech.

He said he was proud of the progress of American education; grateful for the work of the NEA in promoting the opportunity and the goals of popular education.

He quoted from Proverbs: "Calamity comes like a whirlwind to those who hate knowledge."

He quoted from Lincoln: "I view education as the most important subject which we as a people can be engaged in." He spoke with approval of Lincoln's signing of the Land Grant College Act. He identified schools with national defense and said, "Our schools are more important than our Nike batteries . . . more powerful even than the energy of the atom."

Turning to more specific issues, he acknowledged the long period in the recent past when school buildings were not built because of various national emergencies. He said that there should be temporary federal help to provide stimulus to correct this emergency situation. He said that "after the bricks are laid and the mortar is dry, the federal mission will be completed and all control and use of the schools will be in the hands of state and local authorities." He concluded with ringing praise for teachers and their indispensable work. In a brief departure from his written text, he adlibbed his definition of a good teacher: "An individual who is very good at explaining to those who don't understand easily and who is very good at understanding those who can't explain."

The speech concluded, he immediately accepted Miss Shull's invitation to cut the enormous NEA Centennial cake and to light one of its candles. To the accompanying cheers of the crowd and the fidgety apprehension of the nearby Secret Service men, the President took the beribboned handle of the two-foot long blade and made the first cut in the cake. He waved again to the delighted crowd and was gone.

It was a great evening which gave the NEA position on federal aid the most explicit support that the President had thus far shown. Not unconnected, perhaps, was the fact that in the morning the House Subcommittee on General Education had given the Kelley Bill, HR 1 which embodied the NEA recommendations, a favorable bipartisan vote of six to one. The House vote and the President's appearance at the dinner were two very good Centennial birthday presents for the NEA.

Spring in 1957 turned to summer (as it does every year) and, as also had happened for many years, favorable action by the Congress was not forthcoming. By the time of the NEA Centennial Convention in the first week of July it was clear that the federal aid bill was in serious trouble. We would have welcomed another address by the President at the Convention but after the Centennial dinner in April, another personal appearance was more than we could reasonably expect. The President had gone as far as he would or could at the April dinner. We were, however, given the promise of attendance by the Vice-President, Richard M. Nixon.

He arrived in Philadelphia on the concluding night of the Convention. He informed the Assembly frankly that there was no better than an even chance that the school construction bill would pass the House during the then current session of Congress. He estimated the chances of enactment of such a bill in the Senate as zero. But he did hold out hope that the legislation could be enacted at the next session. While admitting the existence of various reasons for the slow movement of this legislation, he said that the school construction bill was a casualty of the battle of the budget. "With our tremendous outlay for national defense today," he said, "and 75 percent of the federal budget, directly or indirectly is related to national defense" we cannot have all of the domestic programs we want. Congress and the American people it represents must be more completely convinced that the classroom shortage is so critical that emergency federal action is not merely desirable but also urgently necessary. Thus perished our hopes for action in 1957.

On February 20, 1958, I found myself facing the Second Session of the 85th Congress, through the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I began by reminding the Committee that another school year had ended since my last appearance before it. In the interval, except for much eloquent talk about the importance of education, nothing at all had been *done.* Where would we be now, I asked, if Congress last summer had enacted the proposed legislation to finance school construction. The answer: about $300 million worth of badly needed classrooms would have been built or be in the process of completion, with good side-effects on employment and the national depressed economy.

I wondered aloud whether those in Congress and others who had managed to sidetrack the school legislation last year could look back with pride on their achievement. Month after month they had assured all who would heed them that the states and localities could and would get the needed schools erected. They had been terribly wrong, for the voters were rejecting local school construction levies more often than ever.

Meanwhile the Russian launch of Sputnik I in October, 1957, had triggered a long-overdue national appraisal of education. President Eisenhower urged us to compare our schools with those of the Soviet Union. But the President deleted his previous school construction funds from the 1958-59 budget.

I informed the Committee that seven million public school students were attending classes of over thirty pupils; that 800,000 pupils were on half-day sessions; that there was a shortage of at least 140,000 classrooms; that one out of four teachers was paid less than $3,500 a year. I quoted Admiral Rickover:

> "Education is more important than the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force, or even the Atomic Energy Commission . . . One of the first steps I would take (in educational reform) would be to immediately double the salaries of all teachers . . . If there were not enough money for this aid I would as a military man take the money away from a defense establishment."

The NEA proposal called for $1 billion in the year 1958-59, rising gradually to $4.5 billion by 1961-62. Legislation providing such funds was introduced by Senator James Murray of Montana and Representative Lee Metcalf.

The measure was not enacted. A handful of persons in the House Rules Committee had been able for years to bottle up almost every kind of action of federal support for education. A single vote in the Rules Committee might have been enough to loosen the log jam. We were downcast by this apparently endless frustration but the coming Presidential election gave us new hope.

The 1960 Campaign, Kennedy and Nixon

The nomination of the Republican party went to Vice-President Nixon. In September he issued a campaign statement entitled, "A National Program in Support of Education." As is usually the case in political declarations by either party, Mr. Nixon's statement contained exhortations regarding the great national importance of education, but in practical terms his position was less satisfactory. A close reading indicated that he would make no federal funds available for teachers' salaries although he was strongly in favor of better pay for teachers. He argued that if the federal government would share the cost of school construction, local funds would be released to improve the salaries of teachers and local control of education could be maintained.

I then circulated a carefully prepared memorandum on this topic for use by the NEA staff. I used parts of this memorandum myself in addresses on a number of occasions during the campaign. It was my consistent policy not to urge people to vote for one candidate or the other in any of the national elections which occurred while I was Executive Secretary of the NEA. I did not, however, hesitate to say that teachers and members of the public should understand clearly the difference between the two presidential candidates with regard to their views on education.

I pointed out several difficulties in Mr. Nixon's policy statement. First, a community that did not happen at the moment to need school construction, and there were many such, would be taxed to build schools in other communities; that is, school districts and taxpayers would be penalized for having sacrificed to provide adequate school housing.

Second, since state or local matching was a condition for receiving the proposed federal grants, such matching, far from releasing other funds as Mr. Nixon had implied would be the case, would encourage localities and states to spend money for construction rather than for teachers.

Third, the Nixon-Eisenhower Administration as well as outspoken opponents of federal support for education usually claimed that providing funds for salaries would inevitably carry with it the control of the educational process. There was and is no evidence to support such a declaration and there is a great deal of evidence to refute it. For example, President Eisenhower had urged that federal funds be provided to augment the salaries of teachers of science, mathematics, and foreign languages under what was eventually known as the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Although in the final text of the legislation no such funds were established, the President did strongly urge them. At that time, therefore, he evidently did not assume that the national government would thereby control the curriculum and methods of teaching.

Furthermore, one-fifth of the children of the nation were receiving instruction from teachers who received all or part of their salaries from federal grants. This included teachers in "impacted" school districts which received national funds both for school construction and salaries. There had never been any serious criticism that this had created federal interference with the work of these teachers. It seemed to me that the Vice-President's statement about the limited program of national support that he was willing to envisage for education should be carefully studied during the political campaign. If his position were to be accepted, it should be done by the citizens with a clear understanding that only in marginal cases would it significantly improve the status of teachers—and teachers are more important than buildings.

The Democratic candidate, John F. Kennedy, was nominated by a convention which had adopted a strong platform plank favoring federal funds for public schools. In August, 1960, I wrote to Senator Kennedy, congratulating him on his nomination and stressing the need for legislation that would allow the states to spend federal school subsidies for school operation as well as school construction.

During the ensuing campaign, Senator Kennedy made it clear that he was committed, if elected, to support federal aid for public schools only. This assurance certainly played a part in the narrow margin by which he attained the White House. Shortly after the election I sent him a telegram of good wishes and suggested an early conference to discuss how the National Education Association could most effectively support his legislation for education. He kept his campaign promises faithfully.

John F. Kennedy and federal aid

On February 7, 1962, the *Washington Post* carried a notice in its daily White House appointments list that I was to see President Kennedy at 10:30 that morning. I had not asked for a definite appointment and I still do not know what administrative snafu caused the item to be published without notice to me. However, I wasted no time in asking questions, but rather got the best briefing available from appropriate staff colleagues and presented myself at the time specified in the paper. Even this early in his Administration it had become clear that President Kennedy was to give more than lip service to public elementary and secondary education, not merely temporary aid for school construction but rather for the entire gamut of educational necessities including teachers' salaries. It was clear that this Administration intended to try hard to do more than sigh at each congressional session's conclusion, "Too bad; the Rules Committee killed it."

We met, to my surprise, for more than the traditional fifteen minutes. I remained for a full half-hour with no sense of pressure.

I think that the President wanted to reassure himself by first-hand experience that the support of the teaching profession for the legislation he was sponsoring would be forceful and unwavering. He was playing for keeps and he wanted to feel sure that his natural allies were doing the same. I did my best to reassure him on this point. I also endeavored to express my gratitude to him for his general leadership, not only in the financing of education but also in his whole attitude toward the educated person which motivated so much of the President's behavior.

The President was fully aware of the existence of the House Rules Committee and the almost constant abuse of its powers by failing to report out school legislation. I agreed that the reputation of the House Rules Committee in this respect was very bad but pointed out some of the recent encouraging events. For example, the Rules Committee had unanimously voted out legislation on aid for colleges and universities. This led to the hope that at least a majority of the Rules Committee would vote out legislation for the elementary and secondary schools, particularly in the light of his special message which said that aid to higher education would be of limited utility without the supporting legislation at the lower school level.

I also cited recent NEA public opinion polls which were unusually encouraging in their showing of a strongly favorable attitude among the American electorate as a whole. I cited in particular a University of Michigan poll which showed that when people were asked what they were most willing to pay more taxes for, they responded: first, for education; second, for care for the aged; and third, for national military defense. I think I reassured the President; I know he reassured me.

The So-called Educational "Quality" Bill

The House of Representatives, as usual, was far behind the Senate in the speed and vigor with which it attacked basic educational problems. As late as March 20, 1962—more than a year after the Senate had considered President Kennedy's proposals, the House was still fumbling around with a strange mixture called HR.10145, the "Improvement of Educational Quality Act of 1962." One section of this proposal provided for small grants to state education departments for experimental projects in education. It was worded so as to be unduly restrictive and to threaten local control of education. Another section offered finance to provide institutes for advanced study by teachers but it needlessly placed too much control in the hands of the federal bureaucracy, which would have power not only to select the sites for the institutes but also the subject matter to be covered. Grants for teacher education were provided in unstated amounts, for an unstated duration, in institutions to be selected by the United States Commissioner on the advice of a new committee consisting of an undetermined number of persons selected by himself. The House hearing procedure was a case of much ado about almost nothing. I told the Committee that we could support the general purpose of the proposed legislation but that no great improvement in educational quality could be expected from such fragmentary legislation.

All our efforts, however, were doomed. After the Administration bill had triumphantly passed the Senate under the skilled leadership of Senator Morse and Senator Hill, it was sidetracked in the House of Representatives by a one-vote margin (8-7) in the Rules Committee.

By this vote, eight of the most conservative members of Congress tabled all Bills to strengthen the schools. They were afraid to let these measures come to a vote on the House floor because they believed the House might approve them. Such action to frustrate the will of the majority by a parliamentary maneuver is a punishing blow to the democratic process itself. It had happened before and it continues even today. Unless the House Rules Committee is deprived of its power to deny the majority of its right to vote, the legislative process in this country will remain seriously imperfect.

Federal Aid to higher education

In the NEA Representative Assembly in Denver in 1962 a resolution was adopted which was destined to have very serious consequences. The subject was federal aid to higher education. The resolution presented to the Assembly called for federal support for *public* higher education and specified college housing loans and scholarship funds as approved objectives for such support. An amendment was offered to change the word "public" to read instead "publicly-controlled and tax-supported institutions." Other textual amendments were offered, all of them clearly directed to the same general purpose: to exclude all assistance to privately controlled institutions of higher education. After a long discussion, the proposed amendments were incorporated into the resolution. The small changes in wording were subtle but collectively clear and important. Under the original text the NEA was committed by its governing body to withhold its support from federal aid for private higher education. Under the amended version the NEA was committed to work *against* the enactment. There is a difference between active opposition and neutrality.

The opinion and advice of the staff and of experienced NEA leaders was all for the original text and against the amendment. But the amendment was supported by a majority of the delegates led by several articulate and widely respected past-presidents and other leaders. The approval of the amendment, however, had at least this advantage: it showed that the employed staff did not inevitably control the policy decisions of the elected delegates. Democracy had again triumphed in the affairs of the NEA. Whatever future damage might be done to the Association was self-inflicted. I sometimes thought that one of my chief responsibilities as the NEA Executive Secretary was to do my best to persuade the Association's officers and governing bodies to refrain from doing unintentional harm to themselves and to the Association.

In only a few months the test came. The House and the Senate earlier in 1962 had passed two different bills on aid to higher education. The House bill provided construction grants to public and non-public higher education institutions but no student loans or scholarships. The Senate bill provided for construction *loans* (not grants) for higher education academic facilities and a substantial scholarship program. This all occurred before the Denver Convention and we had supported the Senate version which was closely in line with President Kennedy's proposals.

The legislation then went, in the usual manner, to a House-Senate Conference Committee. On September 17, 1962, a closed session of the Conference Committee voted out a compromise including student aid, contrary to the House policy, and a program of federal construction grants for engineering, science, and library buildings in *both* public and private institutions. The NEA was obliged by its new resolution to oppose enactment. The House conferees had been instructed by vote of the House not to approve scholarships and a motion to recommit the measure was offered on these grounds. After a bitter debate, during which the NEA's power as a lobby was exaggerated to a most flattering extent, the motion to recommit passed by a vote of 214 to 186.

In the House gallery at the time the vote was taken, I remember vividly my chagrin at being required to rejoice in the defeat of an aid-to-education measure.

The vote evoked much bitterness. The fact that the NEA had in the past successfully supported much good legislation for higher education was of little help. Many staunch friends of the NEA in Congress were very angry about the vote and the part the NEA played in bringing it about. In some cases weeks and months had to elapse before normal polite (not to say cordial) relationships could be established. The White House staff, including President Kennedy himself, were furious and found ways to let us know it.

The volume of critical mail I received from educators, including many NEA members, was formidable, far outnumbering the letters in support of our action to carry out the mandate of the Denver Representative Assembly.

As for the White House, some of the staff there never forgave us. I had a difficult interview with President Kennedy. He told me that he had been bitterly disappointed when Cardinal Spellman had contributed so much to the demise of the Administration Bill to aid the public elementary schools. My own action in behalf of the NEA in contributing to the loss of his efforts to aid higher education, he bluntly said, was just as destructive as the Cardinal's attack at the lower level. I did not argue the matter; I simply said that if I had to sin I would rather sin in company with Cardinal Spellman than anyone else. He smiled at that. He was soon at work on another approach, the "one package" idea, a bill which would, he hoped, unite the friends of federal aid to education and divide its enemies.

The President's initial proposals were vigorously attacked by most of the Catholic press, especially because he had said that nothing would take precedence over his oath of office. In 1961 the President's position was attacked again when he proposed federal aid to public education only—attacked (in my view) with unbecoming bias and a dismaying lack of fairness. Cardinal Spellman, his father's old friend, now became, on this topic, one of his most vigorous critics. Speaker of the House John McCormick, in spite of his long record of liberal legislation on other subjects, opposed the President on education, almost openly. President Kennedy then reluctantly agreed to split his bill, providing on the one hand aid to operate public schools only, on the other hand, aid for school construction in which parochial schools could, under certain conditions, share. Even so, Speaker McCormick and Howard W. Smith, Chairman of the House Rules Committee, saw to it that President Kennedy's proposals never got beyond those Committee barriers.

After numerous hearings before congressional committees and innumerable formal and informal meetings between representatives of the public schools and the parochial schools, the position of the

Catholic Church at that time was made abundantly clear to President Kennedy and to any others interested. This position was reiterated by those qualified to speak for his Church on many occasions, all the way through to the tragic end of the Kennedy Administration. It would oppose any New Frontier legislation which did not recognize the private schools on precisely the same basis as the public schools for the purpose of receiving public funds.

The Rose Garden

For groups of fifty or so people who came to the White House to meet him, President Kennedy seemed to enjoy using the small garden just outside the Cabinet room. The space was enclosed on two sides and protected thus from nearby street noises, pleasant when the weather was fine, and, with slight aid from a voice-amplifier, easy to talk in. On November 19, 1963, the executive secretaries of the NEA state affiliates met there with President Kennedy. Robert Wyatt, the 1963-64 NEA President, and I went there first and spoke with members of the White House publicity and press division before meeting the President briefly in the Cabinet room. He appeared to have entirely overcome his feelings of frustration about the lack of success in the previous session of Congress and was ready and eager to try again.

Speaking a few minutes later to the state secretaries gathered in the Rose Garden, the President first thanked them for their help in trying to meet the needs of education in this country. He said that the flood of children coming into the lower schools is already visible; the education job can't be done without full cooperation, local, state, and national. He was hopeful and determined that the United States Government would do its full share.

Congress, he said, would be judged in part by its educational legislation. He expected it to do more for education than any Congress in the last century. He spoke for about twenty minutes.

NEA President Robert Wyatt assured the President that he had an immense reservoir of goodwill among educators and enthusiastic support for his recommendations. The President said he would be glad to meet the members of the group individually and invited everyone to visit the White House. It was, although none of us could have guessed it, John Kennedy's farewell to each of us.

The NEA has a five-minute film of the highlights of this Rose Garden meeting, the last official appointment of John F. Kennedy with a group at the White House, just three days before his untimely death by assassination.

L.B.J.: "Let us continue."

When President Johnson entered the White House he continued to seek the legislative goals of President Kennedy. Many people were seeking a way to resolve an apparent impasse. I remember, for example, one evening with Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel, discussing how a new effort to secure federal support for education should be launched. It occurred to us that the plan of distribution might be the key to the puzzle. We considered relating the amount to be given to each state to some measures of state economic ability which had not heretofore been tried. At Commissioner Keppel's request, I asked the NEA Research Division to compile some statistics showing the results of applying various formulas. Search for an acceptable mode of distribution was general in Washington at that time. The legislation finally proposed by President Johnson used a formula which related federal aid legislation to the War on Poverty. There was another unique aspect of the proposals by President Johnson: namely, making it easier for students in parochial schools to be taught in the public schools with funds made available under the proposed law.

This was really a minor concession because any child of any religious faith may enroll in a public school at any time. And if he or she can enroll fulltime, the child could, subject to minor administrative inconvenience, be permitted to enroll parttime. Thus I think the legislation conferred on the parochial schools, and the children who attended them, no substantial new advantages. Nevertheless, this slight change, together with the link between the War on Poverty and Aid to Education, powerfully aided by President Johnson's deep concern and immense skill in negotiation and persuasion, was enough to bring about the enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

I cannot adequately express my appreciation of the role that Presidents Kennedy and Johnson played in this success. I have already indicated the nation's indebtedness to President Kennedy. The objectives of the two Presidents were substantially identical. Their styles of operation, however, were individual and different.

President Johnson somehow generated a sense of urgency and intensity. His Special Message to Congress on Education in early 1964 was one of the strongest commitments to education ever to come from the White House. During the three months that the Administration Bill was before Congress, President Johnson kept this legislation, in his own words, "at the top of America's agenda."

The Congress, however, did not find President Johnson's enthusiasm instantly contagious. On October 11, 1964, the *New York Times* announced editorially that both Congress and the Administration had "abandoned the battle for general aid to the nation's public elementary and secondary schools." The reason for this strategic retreat was clear: "Past experience has shown that any attempt either to include or exclude aid to Roman Catholic parochial schools foundered over the issue of church-state separation." So 1964 ended with the elusive general aid still beyond attainment.

The year did not end, however, without some achievement in Congress. On October 16, 1964, the President signed a law which greatly extended the scope of the National Defense Education Act, originally passed in 1958. The 1964 revision broadened the Act to include, in addition to the original fields of science, mathematics, and foreign languages, the areas of English, reading, history, geography, and civics. An extended program of vocational training was also enacted and signed. Senator Morse of Oregon, who managed these Bills on the floor, wrote to thank the NEA Legislative Commission for the support the Association had given to the legislation. Without that support, he wrote, the legislation "would have been but a poor, pale, miserable thing." That was true enough but still the legislation left much to be desired. Stronger and more important legislation was even then in preparation for the consideration of the Congress in 1965.

President Johnson at work

On February 11, 1965, while attending a meeting of the NEA Board of Directors in Atlantic City, I received a telephone call from one of the President's aides. Naming three other NEA officers, the aide said, "The President wants to see you here at ten o'clock tomorrow." I said that the NEA Board of Directors was in session and that all four officers were needed in Atlantic City. Could we come to Washington the next day?

"The *President,*" said my caller, "wants you here at ten o'clock tomorrow."

I said that the last plane from Atlantic City had already left and none tomorrow could get us to Washington on time. We could perhaps charter a small plane for tomorrow.

"You might be grounded by weather," said the caller, "and you are to be here at ten o'clock."

I said "Yes, sir!" or its equivalent, rented a car to leave at 5:30 a.m. for the four-hour drive to Washington, asked my deputy to take charge of the Directors, and the Vice-President to preside at their meeting. We appeared at the White House gate with twenty minutes or so to spare.

I have recited the episode to illustrate the kind of White House staff support that President Johnson demanded—and got. This was a relatively easy demand, I am told, as compared to other issues and other occasions.

The four of us, all the way to Washington, had talked in detail about what was to happen during our conversation and agreed among ourselves as to which of us should be ready to deal with various topics that might be brought up. It was a waste of time. The President took charge immediately on arrival. He asked us to identify the individuals and groups that might be opposed to the legislation. As each possible source of opposition was mentioned, the President immediately outlined a plan for minimizing it or avoiding it—not by changing the legislation but by impact on the individual. He gave his instructions immediately to a White House staff member. "Tell A and B to go together to see X, emphasize how much this bill is needed. Tell X I sent them. Try to ease his objections whatever they are. Better yet: let A and B see X separately on successive days. Let the first one advise the second one what the trouble spots are. Give me a verbal report on their success or lack of it. What next?"

This is not, of course, a verbatim account. No one had time to make notes except the one who was getting an assignment. But I believe it correctly reflects the energy and velocity with which President Johnson hurled himself at the opposition. After our list of possible opponents had been reviewed and assigned or (in a few instances) dismissed as hopeless, the conference was over. The President said, "Why don't we have some coffee in here?" in a tone

343

that implied that he had repeatedly, and in vain, asked for coffee hours ago. We drank our coffee gratefully and withdrew, reaching Atlantic City about 4 p.m. the same day.

In the six weeks following our meeting with the President, we brought more than 250 selected NEA members to Washington in weekly relays. They testified before committees of Congress, visited their Senators and Representatives, provided information on the state of the schools in their own districts and then went home to rally more support for the legislation among their colleagues and members of the public. The non-partisan conduct of these efforts was a major contribution to winning votes from both sides of the Congressional aisle. On March 1, President Johnson invited a group of NEA leaders to the White House East Room and there pledged his full support for greater federal activity to help the schools. A film was made of this historic event. Four hundred and seventy-five prints of that film with sound track were then shown to millions of citizens at thousands of meetings. A continuous flood of letters and telegrams to members of Congress was maintained. Religious groups and most elements of organized labor, as well as many other groups, supported the legislation, but the NEA had to carry the major part of the responsibility. I augmented the regular staff on Federal Relations with special assignments to NEA staff members from other units.

The entire effort culminated in passage by triumphantly large majorities, 263 to 153 in the House and an overwhelming vote in the Senate, 73 to 18. The President signed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act on April 11, 1965 in the little schoolhouse on the Texas prairie where he had himself been a teacher many years before.

Evaluating the results

When he signed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), the President remarked, "No law I have signed, or will ever sign, means more to the future of America." Have these bravely hopeful words been warranted by subsequent events?

Ten years after ESEA became law, a member of the Institute for Educational Leadership assessed the results of this legislation.[1] In spite of brave talk at the time of enactment, that annual appropriations would reach $5 billion by 1969, the ESEA appropriation reached only $2 billion by 1975. It was then providing only about $40 per pupil per year and amounted to about three percent of total public school revenues. Still, ESEA had substantial multiplier effects, exceeding the actual appropriations. The new law defused the explosive church-state issue and ended the long impasse about the propriety of federal action on the school scene. It made federal aid to education an enduring fact of political life. It established the concept of compensatory educational treatment for children from poverty homes. It is not unduly optimistic to conclude that, because of ESEA, the national commitment to equality of opportunity for disadvantaged children will be intensified.

---

[1] Halperin, Samuel, "ESEA Ten Years Later." *Educational Researcher* 4:5-9 (September 1975).

Other federal, state, and local efforts to achieve more equitable opportunity have been encouraged by ESEA, including attention to out-of-school youth, children of migratory workers, neglected and delinquent youth, handicapped children, pre-school children, children whose native tongue is not English, and under-nourished children.

ESEA has also promoted more parental and community involvement in schooling, recruited able and idealistic young teachers, improved relations between public and private schools, positively affected the movements for assessment and accountability in educational achievement, and strengthened the roles of leadership and service among the state departments of education.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was a major new national commitment, the greatest single legislative victory for NEA policy in the past half century.

Until this legislation, Congress had extended federal aid to education only as "categorical" aids–to vocational education during World War I, emergency aid during the Depression and in the 'Thirties, and the National Defense Education Act to help meet the Cold War challenge of the 'Fifties. The new legislation was different. It aimed to improve education for the children of low income families. The local school authorities could use the first appropriation of about $1 million to employ more teachers, improve curriculum, prevent school dropouts, provide supplementary health services, buy special equipment, operate summer programs, expand vocational training, increase library facilities, or by almost any other means which their ingenuity could devise.

Among many other provisions, the new law authorized $100 million for local public authorities to purchase books and other teaching materials. The selection, ownership, and control of these materials remain with the local authorities but they may provide for lending them for a long time to any interested individual–child or adult–just as public libraries do.

The largest organized dissent had come from the Teachers Union of New York City, AFL-CIO, which sent telegrams at a crucial moment to every member of the House from New York City urging defeat of the legislation. The American Federation of Teachers conducted a plebiscite among its members on whether to support or oppose the legislation. The poll was completed about nine weeks after the President had signed the Bill into law. I have not seen a report on how the plebiscite turned out.

Celebrating a breakthrough

There were numerous celebrations of this NEA success but the most prestigious and heartwarming occurred on July 2, 1965 at Madison Square Garden. The President came to the New York meeting of the NEA to discuss further steps to aid the schools. He received a tumultuous welcome, was awarded the rare honor of Life Membership, and delivered a stirring address of which the most notable theme was contained in these words:

> As a teacher–I am still on leave of absence from Houston Public Schools (applause)–who has labored with you through the years in the elementary and high schools and a short while in the colleges, I remind you that we have talked together and dreamed together and philosophized together about the great need for all these things for thirty years or more, since I finished college.
>
> We have even urged since then that they be put into the annual party platforms of both the Republican and Democratic Parties for your consideration on Election Day.
>
> Well, I am here to tell you that this is a different day . . . The time for talking and dreaming and philosophizing and writing platforms is gone, and the time for doing things instead of talking about them is here (applause).

I do not recommend the presence of a United States President at an NEA Convention as a rest cure for its Executive Secretary. I had been informed earlier in the week by the Secret Service and by the White House aides that President Johnson was almost sure to attend and speak at our Convention. I was not told when he would come but I was told that it might all be cancelled if it were announced in advance. Thus it was not until about 11:30 a.m. of the last day of the Convention that the Secret Service told me that we could now announce to the delegates that the President would appear that afternoon. I was told at the same time that Mrs. Johnson would accompany the President, that my wife and I should meet them at a certain hangar at Kennedy Airport, that there would be no one else in the meeting party, that the road to Madison Square Garden would be cleared of other traffic, that we would escort the President and Mrs. Johnson from the airport to the city and into the Garden via a certain door and as expeditiously as possible. This, I thought, would give me a splendid opportunity to brief the President on the Convention which he was to address. I was mistaken about that!

The President would speak from our regular stage in the Garden and the Secret Service urged me to limit the number of others on the stage. This question of who should sit on the platform from which the President spoke became highly volatile as soon as his advent was announced. The Texas delegation put in its bid, as did sundry staff members and NEA officials. I finally declared that only the people listed in the program to be on the stage for the rest of the afternoon's business would occupy the stage. I doubt if anything I ever said or did caused more deeply wounded feelings.

We had serious difficulties in getting to Kennedy Airport through the Independence Day crowds leaving New York City like sea-bound lemmings. But we were there in time to wait about ten minutes for U.S. Air Force One to land and wheel around to the designated space. Before landing we were assigned to limousines in which we were to ride—the President, my wife and Mrs. Johnson in the back seat; Senator Morse, HEW Secretary Celebreese, and myself on the three "jump" seats in the next row; the driver and two Secret Service men in the front seat of the bullet-proof "bubble-top."

As we arranged ourselves for the quick drive into town the President turned his attention to Senator Morse. They had evidently been talking on the flight from Washington. The President

347

was continuing and completing a fairly detailed description of the way in which he proposed to conduct an international peace campaign to end the Vietnam War, a war which Senator Morse had already publicly denounced. President Johnson described how he would send this ambassador to this city, and that public official to that prime minister, and so on. He urged Senator Morse to visit Vietnam as soon as Congress adjourned. Every travel facility would be provided and every source of information would be open to the Senator. He could talk to anybody and stay as long as he wished. When the Senator returned, the President wanted him to report his conclusions personally, particularly on how the war could be terminated. With minor interruptions the President's plea took all the time on the trip. I cannot find words to evoke adequately the intensity, the profound earnestness, and the authority with which he urged this course of action on Senator Morse. It was a remarkable example of the "jawboning" or "arm-twisting" for which the President was famous.

Senator Morse said nothing. This statement may induce incredulity among people who knew Senator Morse well. The Senator was not noted, to put it mildly, for taciturnity. He was, in fact, one of the most articulate and fluent men in the Senate – and *that* is the highest standard I can think of for loquacity. I have seen Senator Morse in various moods and situations but I never saw him, except on this one occasion, completely silent. The President, intent on expounding every available argument to support his request, did not appear to notice the absence of response. It is just possible that Senator Morse did not wish to refuse the President's request in the presence of several witnesses. The President clearly did not care who else was listening to him. Now that both parties to this conversation (it would be more accurately called a monologue) are dead, I see no reason for me to fail to report it. Senator Morse, of course, did not visit Saigon. The President's 1965 summer "peace offensive" failed.

The Elementary and Secondary Education legislation, however, was only one of sixty new laws relating to the schools which were enacted during President Johnson's Administration. In December 1968, about three weeks before President Johnson left the White House, I had the pleasure of organizing a group of about forty leaders from the organizations in Washington which had worked for federal school legislation. We called at the White House to express to President Johnson our gratitude for all he had done for

American education. It seemed to me that such recognition was due and proper. We gave the President at that time a volume recording the major items of legislation affecting education passed during his administration. This was an impressive list which ran all the way from Headstart programs for young children to aid to graduate schools. The volume included the names of the organizations participating in the ceremony and a brief tribute which I wrote under the title, "The Teacher in the White House." I believe the President was touched and gratified by this expression of our appreciation.

Many more changes are required before the full responsibility of the Federal Government in education is met. We made a breakthrough in 1965, but a breakthrough only establishes a bridgehead which requires vigorous followthrough.

16 Civil Rights

First integrated convention in the south - Fair employment practices - Largest parliamentary body in the world - Debate on the court decision, 1954-1955-1956-1957-1958-1959-1960-1961 - The "second affiliates": historical background - The "second affiliates" 1961-1962-1963-1964-1965-1966-1967 - Time devoted to integration topic in NEA business sessions, 1954-67 - General observations and reflections - The press - The NEA as a civil rights organization

In July 1952, a few weeks before I took office as Executive Secretary, the NEA leadership held a planning conference at St. Mary's Lake, Michigan. Asked to predict the probable major future events affecting education, I told the planning conference, as the first item*, that racial segregation in the schools would be passed upon by the courts within the next five years. We did not need to wait that long. The Supreme Court decision on school integration came on May 17, 1954. The Alabama bus boycott of 1955, the "all deliberate speed" ruling by the Supreme Court in the same year, and the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 are a few of the related events which greatly changed the nation. In one aspect or another, the NEA position on civil rights profoundly concerned me almost every day during the remainder of my term of office. During these troubled fourteen years I clung to two major principles: first, that in the conduct of its own affairs the NEA itself would avoid and repudiate every form of racial discrimination; second, that the unity of the teaching profession should be preserved. To apply either one of these two principles would have been relatively easy; to keep both of them alive in a delicately balanced symbiosis was often extremely difficult. I shall give first two examples of events prior to the 1954 Supreme Court decision in *Brown vs. Topeka.*

---

*The other issues I predicted for 1952-57 were: church-state relations in education; war or peace; maintaining civil liberties; and labor relations.

First integrated convention in the south

When I assumed office in August 1952 the Board of Directors of the Association had already voted in July 1952 to hold the 1953 NEA Convention in Miami Beach, Florida. However, at the next meeting of the NEA Board of Directors, October 1952, the Board was advised by the executive secretaries of the Florida Education Association and the Florida State Teachers Association that they could endorse only Miami as the 1953 site. It became clear to me that only Miami *Beach*, Florida, could provide at that time for integrated hotels and restaurants. I therefore declined to move the NEA Convention across Biscayne Bay. The Board of Directors supported me in this position. Thus it happened that at the first convention which I served as Executive Secretary, the NEA became the first major national organization to hold a fully-integrated convention in the south.

Those readers, if any there be, who are too young to recall the early 1950's cannot easily imagine the turmoil and pother, the threats, and the danger of violence which in those days accompanied such a decision. In the event, the Miami Beach Convention was eminently successful and almost completely uneventful as far as race relations are concerned. In the headquarters hotel a few members of the housekeeping staff balked at having to tidy up a room that had been occupied by black delegates. The Roney Plaza management soon worked that problem out amicably. Tom Smith, the Convention Bureau Manager for Miami Beach, made sure that the hotels and restaurants did what they had promised. As for me, this example, which preceded the school desegregation rulings, illustrates the general policy which I tried to follow on this issue; namely, to go as far as I could and as fast as I could without splitting the Association so much as to render it dangerously ineffective.

Fair employment practices

As soon as possible after assuming office I quietly changed the unwritten policy regarding employment opportunities for qualified black personnel in the NEA Washington staff. Soon thereafter the NEA was cited by the Urban League for pioneering a nondiscriminatory employment policy for the District of Columbia. Incidentally, at the same time, I removed from the NEA personnel application form a question about the applicant's religious affiliation. But no one gave us a citation for that! Probably no one noticed.

The development of the official NEA position on civil rights can be traced mainly by a review of the resolutions enacted at each of the annual sessions of the Representative Assembly and of the verbatim record of those sessions. When this process is completed it will be seen that the Association focussed its attention on two successive issues: (1) the approval or disapproval of the Supreme Court rulings and decrees, and (2) the approval or disapproval of the continued affiliation of segregated local and state associations. The first theme was dominant for seven years from 1954 to 1960; the second for the seven years from 1961 to 1967, with some discussion of both issues in the transition years of 1960 and 1961.

Before tracing the trends of these sharp and sustained debates, I should describe the Assembly in which they took place.

Largest parliamentary body in the world

The NEA Delegate Assembly was, and probably still is, the largest deliberative body in the world which follows parliamentary procedure. There were usually six or seven thousand delegates, the majority of whom had no experience of previous meetings. Every delegate had equal rights to take the floor. No question was considered minor in the opinion of some member of this vast group. Even under the best conditions, the presiding officer was too far from most delegates to recognize even close acquaintances on sight. One President, only partly in jest, kept a pair of binoculars at hand. From ten to twenty microphones were scattered about the floor of the auditorium and in the balconies. Each microphone bore a large number and this number was waved by a delegate wishing to secure the attention of the President and permission to speak. It was inevitable that under such conditions cliques of people with similar ideals and objectives would be formed and that these groups would quickly learn to make sharp use of parliamentary technicalities to advance their purpose.

Debate on the court decision, 1954

The NEA Convention in July 1954 was the first important meeting after the Supreme Court decision on segregation. At that time I told the Delegate Assembly that the Court had decided that it is not in accordance with the United States Constitution to operate a system of public schools which requires the segregation of children. Thus, all state law or local ordinances requiring racially segregated schools were void. But the Court did not at that time tell the litigants just what they must do to give effect to the Court's 1954 decision. Such decrees were postponed for further consideration by the Court and should not be expected until next year.

As far as the conduct of its own affairs are concerned, the NEA, I pointed out, practices no segregation, countenances no discrimination. The Association is already on record as flatly opposed to any form of educational discrimination. The Court has already decided that to require segregation is to discriminate. The NEA Platform also provides that teachers should not suffer discrimination on racial grounds. Furthermore, the Platform has for many years contained a declaration that each state should provide a complete system of public schools. Thus, I said, the existing provisions of the NEA Platform already clearly express the policy of the Association with regard to the matters covered in the Supreme Court decision. Next year, I said, after the specific decrees of the Supreme Court are issued, the Delegate Assembly of 1955 will be able to inquire how the Association may help to give effect to its well-established policies in line with the decrees of the Court.

One state delegation agreed that no resolution should be adopted until the Supreme Court decrees were issued but there was too little general support for this proposal. The resolution adopted in New York City in 1954 said that the NEA Platform and the Supreme Court decisions were based on the same principles. It urged citizens to approach school integration with a spirit of fair play and goodwill. It said that all the problems that might arise in the process of integration could be solved by intelligent, reasonable people interested in national unity and the common welfare.

1955

The decrees of the Court were not available until June 1955. There was thus little opportunity to consider the impact of the decrees on the public schools before the 1955 Delegate Assembly meeting. They contained the now-famous order "to admit to public schools on a racially nondiscriminatory basis with all deliberate speed the parties to these cases." The ambiguity of the words "all deliberate speed" seemed to me to be purposefully evasive. The decrees almost invited further litigation. I have often wished the Court had said simply "at once" or even "within the next four years." It would have saved a great many people a great deal of trouble, and I do not think the American political or judicial systems would have been injured by clarity in this decree.

In reporting to the 1955 Delegate Assembly on the integration decrees, I pointed out again that the NEA Platform, Bylaws, and Resolutions already forbade the Association to countenance discrimination among its members, condemned discrimination for either teachers or children, declared that each state should provide a complete system of public schools from public funds, and urged that all citizens approach the integration order in a spirit of goodwill, reason, fair play, and national unity. In these circumstances, I urged that no further declaration of policy by the Association was then necessary.

The resolution on integration as presented by the Resolutions Committee, however, was almost identical to the one adopted in the previous year. Two amendments were offered. One amendment reiterated in the resolution the long-standing statement, already included in the Platform of the Association, against racial discrimination in the treatment of teachers. The second amendment proposed to change the verb declaring that the Association "*recognizes* that integration concerns every state and territory" to read "*approves*." Both amendments were discussed and rejected.

1956

In the 1956 meeting of the Representative Assembly attention was largely on problems of expanding and revising services in preparation for its Centennial in 1957. The Resolution on Integration with a text like that adopted in 1955, was approved with no amendments and almost no discussion.

1957

In 1957, at the Centennial meeting in Philadelphia, there were so many special events that I made no regular annual report to the Assembly but instead spoke at the closing session in an address entitled, "The Past is Prologue."

In the 1957 Representative Assembly, the resolution submitted by the Committee was almost the same as the one adopted without debate in 1956. But this time there was debate. Two amendments were offered. Both of them intended to make a more emphatic declaration of the moral correctness of integration and of the Supreme Court decisions on the matter. After considerable discussion, both amendments were defeated. The 1957 debates were a replay of those of 1955 and the outcome was the same.

1958

In 1958, the post-Centennial year, my annual report was devoted wholly to an account of the first results of the Expanded Program which had been adopted and financed by a doubling of the NEA dues at the Centennial Convention. In the Representative Assembly, moreover, the 1957 resolution was introduced and adopted without discussion. Those who wished a more aggressive policy on integration tried a different tactic. They introduced the question of integration as "New Business," after the regular resolutions had been adopted. The motion thus presented called for a study of the problems of integration by the Association, with recommendations to be presented to the 1959 Representative Assembly. Unfortunately, this "new business" item came at the end of a very long day and a quorum was not present to act upon it. It was withdrawn.

Shortly after the 1958 Representative Assembly adjourned, the newly-inaugurated President of the NEA took occasion in a report to the Board of Directors to examine the school integration issue and the relation of the NEA thereto. Dr. Ruth Stout, the new NEA President, was the first President since the 1954 decision to take such a step. The danger existed that local school boards in some cases might close the schools rather than integrate them. Some small local systems had already taken such action. President

Stout said that integration had long been a political issue, and now was a legal issue. The main concern of the NEA, she felt, was that the public schools remain open.

1959

Dr. Stout returned to this theme a year later in her Presidential Address. "I am convinced," she said, "after a year of traveling about the country, observing, listening, asking. . .that none of us, *none of us*, really understands all the major aspects of the main problem, let alone the related problems. I am also sure that some of us who are so confident of what should be done immediately really have not taken adequate measures in our own communities, under much less difficult circumstances, to bring about what we advocate for others." This rebuke to the crusading liberals in the northern suburbs was, I think, timely.

The practical effects of this sound advice are difficult to determine. Amendments to the Resolution on Integration in the Schools were more sweeping, numerous, and warmly debated than at any previous meeting.

The first amendment offered was by an individual delegate from New York. The introduction of motions by a delegate "speaking as an individual" was a commonplace event. In this particular instance, the amendment in question had already been rejected by a vote of 133 to 2 in the New York delegation. In voting, too, each delegate was able to act as an individual. In this case the proposed amendment amounted to a substitute motion. The chief effect of the substitute, if enacted, would have been to put the NEA on record in declaring that integration is a desirable national policy. During a lunch break a number of state delegations had an opportunity to consider the amendment. After lunch the Representative Assembly rejected the proposed substitute by a wide margin.

The next amendment took considerably longer. It was not an individual proposal but a formal proposal of the Oregon delegation. The debate was extensive.

One speaker said that during the Scopes "teaching of evolution" trial in 1925, the Chairman of the NEA Resolutions Committee, a midwest college president who a few years later was elected to the Presidency of the NEA, had refused to deal with the issues. According to the Associated Press, Mr. Uel W. Lambkin had explained that "the theory of evolution is capable of so many different phases of interpretation that any resolution bearing upon the subject with directness would arouse opposition, whatever the wording." Thus, said the 1959 speaker ironically, "The NEA was safe. It had aroused no opposition."

On the other side of the issue the most memorable speech was made by Forrest Rozzell for the Arkansas delegation. "To be facetious and clever and courageous on the floor of the Delegate Assembly of the NEA," he began, "is easy." But, said Mr. Rozzell, he was concerned with preservation of public education in Little Rock and in the entire state of Arkansas. His daughter was a senior in Little Rock High School when that school was guarded by federal troops during integration. Another daughter would have attended the tenth grade in Little Rock High School had there been a tenth grade for her to attend. "If we could resolve the issues we face in Little Rock," he told the delegates, "by the passage of a resolution here. . .the whole Arkansas delegation would leave and let you write your own resolution. But we know the problem will not be solved that way." He asked the Assembly instead to think about this question: "What action can this Assembly take which might be of some assistance to us who are on the front line of this struggle in Arkansas?"

In the final vote, all of the Oregon proposals were disapproved and the original text was retained.

The long debate had produced many psychological bruises and abrasions. When it was all over, I tried to apply to the sore spots as much inconspicuous but healing salve as I could. I first complimented the Assembly on the clarity, impartiality, and freedom from personal animosity of the entire debate. I said that it had given me renewed confidence in what the free exercise of the democratic process, under skilled and responsible leadership, could accomplish. I also reminded the Assembly that after watching its deliberations for nearly thirty years I was sure that the spirit in which a resolution was put into effect was at times fully as important as the exact text. I said that I understood the resolution to mean that the NEA in the conduct of its own affairs would display no form, no shadow, no substance of discrimination among the members of the Association. I said that the resolutions collectively clearly provided that the resources of the NEA would be made available to assist any teacher who might be unjustly treated as the result of any local integration problem. It was clear to me that the NEA believed that the public schools of the United States must be kept open and would assist its state and local affiliates as necessary to accomplish that purpose. I also took note of the fact that the NEA Board of Directors had already voted to instruct the staff to prepare a careful review of all available studies of educational problems involved in school integration and said that this report would be expedited as much as possible.

With the elected officials, the Executive Committee, and the Directors, I took the position that the integration controversy was a political question on which teachers are entitled to their personal opinions, just like other citizens–no more and no less. On the political questions teachers had no professional expertness which entitled their opinions to any greater weight than those held by followers of any other occupation. It was not a responsibility of the organized teaching profession to settle these political issues. The NEA as an organization was under no moral or professional obligation to deal with political issues and to break its ranks in the process. The NEA was filling its proper role as representative for the profession when it opposed the closing of schools or the improper treatment of teachers or students as a means of avoiding integration.

1960

In 1960, the Assembly discussion of the integration issue was long and repetitious. The first amendment offered was "That the NEA pledge continued support of the United States Supreme Court on school integration." This time the number of speakers entitled to say that they were speaking on behalf of their state delegations was much greater than before. The following are examples of positions *by entire delegations* on the amendment:

FOR	AGAINST
Arizona	Louisiana
California	Kentucky
Overseas Teachers	Kansas
	Ohio
	Virginia
	Montana
	New Hampshire

This amendment was carried by a close vote—1933 to 1780—on a rarely-requested roll call. Since 5708 official delegates were registered at this Assembly, the number of delegates absent or abstaining was 1995—a greater number than those who voted on either side.

The next amendment was to add a sentence commending communities which made progress toward ending school segregation. This amendment was adopted without debate.

To the more or less "standard" resolution of the past the 1959 Assembly had now adopted two amendments.

Thereupon a third amendment in the form of a substitute was offered. The substitute was a trifle stronger than the original standard and considerably weaker than the amendments already adopted. The middle-ground substitute was then adopted by the Assembly, thereby destroying the earlier amendments.

1961

The discussion of integration at the 1960 Delegate Assembly had been so vigorous that the Resolutions Committee for 1961 decided to abandon the "standard" text originally developed in 1954 and to present a more detailed resolution to the Assembly of 1961 in Atlantic City. The new text, after a long preamble of general principles, requested the officers of the Association to act to (1) assure the maintenance of free public education; (2) promote respect for law; (3) seek to reduce hostility; (4) alleviate anxieties among teachers and administrative officials; (5) support teachers whose rights are menaced; and (6) publicly commend communities that had handled desegregation in a way that maintained free public schools. This proposed text for the first time in many years was brought to the Assembly with the virtually unanimous (only one negative vote) support of the Resolutions Committee of fifty-five members. Furthermore, in drafting the resolution, representatives of the Committee had requested the Executive Secretaries of the "second state affiliates," the black state teachers' associations in the South, to put in writing the resolution they would recommend. Other steps of conciliation and exchange were also taken. Thereupon, the first Assembly speaker, on behalf of the seven remaining "second affiliates," urged the adoption of the resolution as reported.

But all this careful preparation and biracial activity and support failed to ensure a meeting free of debate on this issue.

The resolution did not say in so many words that the NEA supported the Supreme Court decision. An amendment was immediately offered to add such a statement to the resolution. Once again, there was evidence of much careful advance planning in the state delegations. The announced line-up on this amendment, leaving aside the reactions of individuals, was as follows:

FOR	AGAINST
District of Columbia	Pennsylvania
Hawaii	New York
Overseas Teachers	
Maryland	
Arizona	
California	

The amendment was defeated by voice vote and a motion to hold a rollcall vote was defeated by the Assembly. Then almost exactly the same words were offered as an amendment to another section of the same resolution. In spite of some objections, the President ruled the second try in order since it was now offered as an addition to the preliminary statement of principles rather than as part of a mandated program of action. This amendment was adopted and the resolution as thus amended was adopted. The Assembly had voted for the principle but had rejected the explicit implementation of the principle. Thereafter a series of delegations requested that their votes on the amended resolution be recorded.

The 1961 meeting was a turning point. It showed that a majority of the Assembly would no longer accept the recommendations of the Resolutions Committee. It could and would debate them and change them. The opposing requests to be recorded as voting yea or nay showed that the division between the white and black affiliates was growing. An alliance between the separate black associations and the white northern "liberal" delegates had been forged and had scored its first victory.

The "second affiliates": historical background

The point having been settled about the support of the NEA for the 1954 and 1955 decisions of the Supreme Court, the controversy took a new turn and brought into focus a somewhat different issue: i.e., the relations between the separate white and black affiliates.

Some historical background will be necessary at this point. Membership in the National Education Association, since its establishment in 1857, has always been free from racial limitations or requirements. When the Representative Assembly was created in 1920, it became necessary to have an affiliated unit in each state as the framework of representation in the selection of delegates. In each of the southern and border states, there were at that time, two state education associations–one white, the other black. This separation was required by current state law in most of these states and was consistent not only with prevailing customs but also with the "separate-but-equal" judgments of the federal courts as stated most conclusively by the United States Supreme Court in *Plessy vs. Ferguson,* 1896.

Under these circumstances the NEA in 1922 issued charters of affiliation to the white state teachers associations. As far as I can tell from the Association's records, this procedure at that time was assumed without discussion to be necessary and proper. It aroused neither public comment nor private objection. In the states concerned the white association was by far the largest and most influential available affiliate.

Thus a black teacher in a southern state was free to join the NEA but could not be guaranteed a vote in determining the selection of delegates to form NEA policies. This arrangement was clearly not equitable. It should be added, however, that there were numerous instances of black delegates who were designated by the southern white state associations. There was also a much smaller number of instances of black delegates who were designated by the integrated state associations outside of the south and border regions. In the 'Forties, 'Fifties, and 'Sixties, when one saw a Black at an NEA Delegate Assembly one could safely assume that he or she was a delegate from one of the southern states.

Meanwhile a National Association of Teachers in Colored Schools had been formed in 1904. In 1939 it was reorganized as the American Teachers Association with its own set of state affiliates in each of the states where by law or custom schools were separately operated for white and black children. The NEA Committee on Negro Schools, originally created in 1926, became two years later a Joint Committee of the two organizations. The Joint

NEA-ATA Committee worked with considerable success to secure in textbooks a more complete account of the contributions of black people as a part of American history and life, in jointly supporting federal legislation for schools, and increasing the participation of black teachers in the policy-forming agencies of the NEA.

In 1947 a development of long-range importance was brought about. I was, at the time, scarcely aware that it had occurred, but I heard a great deal about it some fifteen years later. On the request of the officers of the segregated black teachers associations, the NEA agreed to recognize a second state affiliate in seventeen states where such separation existed. By the time I became Executive Secretary in 1952, this double affiliation system was fully operative. By 1960 the number of paired separated state associations had been reduced to twelve. But clearly this rate of attrition would not be indefinitely acceptable.

The NEA Board of Directors was composed of at least one Director selected by each affiliated state. The states with larger numbers of NEA members were entitled to select a second director and–in some cases–a third and a fourth. When the number of members in the southern states with dual affiliation increased to the point at which selection of a second state director would be in order, these states, without exception, chose the additional director from among their black NEA members.

In October 1960, I proposed to the principal NEA staff officers–a group which for convenience we called "the Cabinet,"–an eight-year program to unify these organizations. We gave the matter no publicity but we decided to follow the following cautious schedule:

1. Informal but regular meetings of representatives of each pair of state organizations to consider common problems
2. Holding at least one unified state delegation meeting
3. Drafting a new state constitution by representatives of both groups for an inclusive organization
4. Action on the proposed constitution by members of the two organizations

Each of these steps, I suggested, would require about two years, or a total of eight years. When I left office in 1967 the dual affiliates in all but six of the original seventeen states had merged. The remaining six states were scheduled to complete their mergers by 1969.

Meanwhile, in 1966, we merged the NEA and the American Teachers Association (ATA). That appears in retrospect like a simple and rational thing to do. But, in fact, three years of negotiations were required to achieve the desired result. Only after extended debate did the Representative Assembly pass a motion requesting the Joint Committee of the NEA and ATA to consider and report on whether and under what circumstances it would be feasible and desirable to merge the two organizations.

A number of leaders in the ATA were wary of a merger. On the one hand, they believed in integrated schools, integrated organizations, an integrated society. Yet for the holders of state and local offices in the ATA considerations of prestige had to be taken into account. For the employees of the state ATA affiliates, considerations of career and livelihood were involved.

In the final merger agreement the NEA agreed to accept as active members all members of ATA currently in good standing, to accept as NEA life members all ATA life members whose ATA fees were fully paid, to credit ATA life members whose fees were partially paid toward NEA life membership, and to offer the members of the small ATA staff appointments to the staff of the NEA Southeastern Regional Office in Atlanta.

The "second affiliates:" 1961

The new issue first came before the Association by way of a problem arising in Virginia. In April 1961 the Arlington (Virginia) Education Association voted to accept black teachers into membership. A month later the Board of Directors of the Virginia (State) Education Association adopted a resolution reiterating that any local association in the state which admitted black members would no longer be considered an affiliate of the VEA.

This was civil war within the teaching profession and the NEA promptly established a special committee to recommend "a just and ethical solution." In November 1961, the all-white Delegate Assembly of the VEA cautiously approved "the appointment of a committee to study the possibility of local option in the membership policy of its local affiliates." Soon thereafter the NEA special committee met. It commended the VEA for considering local option, urged the Arlington teachers to reaffiliate with VEA as soon as the local option plan was approved, and recommended that when local option is exercised all members of the local affiliate should be equally eligible for VEA membership. Both groups accepted the special committee's recommendations and this particular case was closed. The basic issue itself, however, was a continuing and increasing source of dispute and conflict throughout the Association wherever the separate affiliation of the two racial groups existed. The action to establish a category of "second affiliates" which had been hailed as an enormous forward stride in 1947, had in a few years become to many members a symbol of indefensible weakness in NEA structure.

1962

The 1962 Delegate Assembly reiterated the resolution of 1961 with only one minor amendment.

1963

In 1963 the Board of Directors, meeting as usual just before the Representative Assembly, decided to try an unusual procedure. Controversial resolutions in the Representative Assembly were typically introduced as "new business" in the weary closing hours of a five-day session. Thus some of the most important issues were decided with the least discussion and debate and a minimum of reflection. The Board knew in advance that the question of segregated state affiliates would be brought up at the closing session, probably with a deadline for compliance. To avoid this contingency, the Board agreed to introduce its own resolution on the opening day of the Assembly and to announce at the same time that it would be formally moved the following day. Accordingly, Lyman Ginger of Kentucky, the NEA Treasurer and a former NEA President, proposed a resolution on behalf of the Board of Directors which

- –commended affiliates that had already removed racial membership barriers
- –offered to establish consultative services to help remove such barriers in other affiliates

- –offered to join with state and local affiliates in holding seminars to promote acceptance of the reasons why such barriers must be removed
- –urged segregated state associations to allow their local affiliates to become racially integrated
- –requested the Joint Committee of the NEA and the American Teachers Association to consider whether and how to merge the two associations and to report within one year

At the same time it was announced that the Joint NEA-ATA Committee had voted to recommend that the 1963 Resolution on School Desegregation be readopted in 1964 without change and that the NEA Directors concur in this recommendation.

The vigorous applause which followed Dr. Ginger's presentation encouraged momentarily the hope that the NEA might complete at least one national meeting without debate on this whole matter.

No sooner had the applause ended than two delegates from Ohio, in a surprise tactic, proposed and seconded a motion that the NEA fully support the Civil Rights Legislation which was then before Congress. There was no debate whatever. No copies of the legislation were at hand and no one even offered a summary for the information of delegates. The motion was declared carried by a majority of affirmative votes. Then the usual litany began: the delegation of the South Carolina Education Association asked to be recorded in opposition; Alabama delegates, "regretting the time and the manner in which the action was taken" opposed the motion 125 to 25; Mississippi by 22 to 6; Georgia by 109 to 35; the Palmetto Education Association (the South Carolina black teachers' affiliate) asked to be recorded as favoring the motion.

The following morning the resolution on desegregation as sponsored by the Board of Directors and presented the previous day came to the floor for action. The amendment offered by the northern "rebel" group would provide that the NEA, instead of encouraging "consultative committees to facilitate" the removal of racial membership restrictions, should instead urge affiliates "to take immediate steps" to open their membership. The difference does not appear to be monumental but a long debate ensued. At one o'clock that afternoon, the parliamentarian announced the absence of a quorum, the remaining delegates went to lunch, most of them both angry and hungry, and the unresolved issue went over to the third day of the Convention.

The amendment occupied most of the morning of the third day and in the crucial vote it was defeated.

The important conclusion which I derived from this experience was that the NEA Delegate Assembly would not readily accept without prolonged discussion the considered advice of its elected Board of Directors. The effort to supply some leadership from the officers had succeeded only at the cost of increasingly bitter recriminations. Our efforts to avoid repetitive debate on these issues had resulted in a Representative Assembly which set a new high record in the amount of time devoted to civil rights controversy and related matters.

The progress toward the removal of racial membership restrictions from the NEA state and local affiliates began to quicken after the adoption of the Board of Directors' proposals in the summer of 1963. In August 1963, I invited the leaders of the 22 remaining dual state associations to meet with me soon to discuss action on the 1963 NEA resolutions. There were many refusals to attend–some just plain stubborn, some genuinely overwhelmed by other duties. I reluctantly had to postpone the conference to the November meeting of the Secretaries of State Teachers Associations. This meeting did give some attention to mergers but necessarily involved a long and varied agenda of its own in which racial membership restrictions could only be one point.

In April 1964 the Florida Education Association removed its white membership clause by a 7 to 2 vote. In May, I tried again to bring together the parties most concerned at the state level. Of the twenty-two state affiliated associations, eighteen sent delegates to a meeting in Louisville.

Mergers of many local associations had meanwhile occurred in some of the most heavily populated areas of the south–for example, Arlington and Fairfax Counties in Virginia; Nashville and Davidson Counties in Tennessee; Dade County, Florida. In Pinellas County, Florida and Chattanooga, Tennessee mergers were scheduled to occur during the year.

Only nine of the twenty-three counties in Maryland still had dual associations by 1963. Six of the remaining nine had completed mergers as of May 14, 1964. There were substantial signs of voluntary merger in North Carolina, Texas,and Arkansas.

1964

I reported these and other developments to the 1964 Delegate Assembly. The policies adopted by the Delegate Assembly of 1963 had already produced results so clear as to justify at least a second year of opportunity as the continued policy of the Association. I had learned, by this and other experiences, that threats and coercion were definitely contra-indicated in this kind of situation. Deadlines and warnings and mandates were not successful ways for a national association to secure the committed help of its affiliates. I warned the 1964 Assembly against punitive measures and/or deadlines.

My warning was not persuasive to the majority of the Assembly. An amendment was offered "to *direct*" all affiliates to remove restrictive racial membership requirements, to give the affiliates a deadline of July 1, 1966 to revise their constitutions, and to present a plan to effect the complete integration of their associations. The vote was close, but the amended motion was carried.

1965

When the Assembly met in 1965 the deadline on mergers had been in effect for one year and was still one year in the future. In my report as Executive Secretary, therefore, I made the best of a policy with which I did not agree. In spite of the difficulties created by the coercive nature of the 1964 resolutions it was possible to make a substantial report of progress in 1965. I also called attention to other civil rights activities of the NEA, activities which in my opinion were far more important than the comparatively trivial question of whether two teachers' organizations would merge within one year or five years. These activities included *inter alia*:

1. An NEA Civil Rights Project to assist teachers and school systems impacted by the civil rights movement and the controversies to which it gave rise.

2. A black teacher who had been active in voter registration in the south was dismissed after twelve years of service. Satisfied that the dismissal was an act of political persecution, the NEA funded a successful appeal to the United States District Court. The NEA also contributed expert witnesses—the first time to my knowledge that

a federal court had accepted testimony regarding professional competence from the organized profession.

3. In January 1965 I advised the black teachers of Selma, Alabama, that the NEA would support them in their efforts to register and vote. We pursued this same idea more generally throughout the country, using the slogan, "Fit to Teach–Fit to Vote."

4. We began the development of a million-dollar Human Rights Fund with a recommended appropriation of $100,000 as a starter from the NEA Board of Directors.

5. In May 1965 when every one of the black teachers in Giles County, Virginia was dismissed upon the commencement of integrated schools in the county, the NEA financed an appeal to the Federal District Court which ruled that the procedure of the local school board was unconstitutional, enjoined the Board against further such practices, and ordered a preferential employment procedure on behalf of the dismissed teachers.

The Assembly discussion in 1965 was brief so far as civil rights and related matters were concerned. An amendment calling for a study of the advisability of creating a Commission on Human Rights was adopted, as was another minor change stating that the merger plans must be jointly developed.

1966

As the Association moved toward the July 1, 1966 deadline, I did all I could, alone and with others, to get the necessary steps taken in time. I was able to report to the Delegate Assembly on June 28, 1966 that all arrangements for a merger of NEA and ATA were completed and that the formal public signing of the merger documents would occur during the current convention.

As far as state association mergers were concerned, the Arkansas and Tennessee Education Associations had never had a "white" membership clause and both organizations had also made clear their intention to guarantee full membership privileges to all. The Virginia Education Association which also had no constitutional barriers had voted to admit all members of its merged local affiliates. These merged local affiliates were the largest ones, employing nearly ninety percent of all VEA members. Constitutional amendments had been adopted to eliminate racial membership barriers in Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South

Carolina, and Texas. In Louisiana, a restrictive membership clause remained in the Constitution, but a Constitutional Revision Committee had been established and would meet in November 1966. Formal merger of the two state organizations in Florida was scheduled for July 1, 1966.

With regard to the second deadline requirement—the presentation of a merger plan, I was able to say that "plans" existed in each of the eleven states involved. However, the degree to which these plans had been developed and scheduled differed considerably from one state to another. Some were quite precise; others were casually cryptic; and others fell between these extremes.

In more general terms I was glad to be able to report that contributions to the NEA Million Dollar Fund for Teachers' Rights had, within one year from the Fund's establishment, reached over $300,000; that a Subcommittee on Civil and Human Rights of Educators had been set up as part of the Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities; that this Subcommittee had held five regional conferences with a total attendance of about 1,250 to assist school districts to integrate school faculties; that a new book on teaching in integrated classrooms had been prepared and published; and that an advisory council had been established to maintain liaison with the major government agencies and private organizations concerned with civil rights.

That evening, in his Presidential Address, the current NEA President turned to the same question and assured the Assembly that after the July 1 deadline the NEA Executive Committee would meet on July 2 "to take the necessary steps so that no affiliate of this Association has any racial barrier to membership and that programs proceed to effect the unity of our local and state affiliates." This statement, which could certainly be regarded as a threat to some NEA affiliates and as a promise to other affiliates, was one that I had carefully avoided. The fact is that neither the NEA President nor any other officer was able to promise what the Executive Committee would do. The threatening posture was a strategic error.

The motion on merger of affiliates precipitated some lengthy discussion. The end result was an amended motion which not only reiterated the July 1, 1966 deadline but also mandated additional deadlines. Executive Committee action to suspend or disaffiliate offending affiliates was given a deadline of September 30, 1966.

An additional deadline of June 1, 1967 was set for merger in accordance with jointly developed plans, but this extension did not apply to an affiliate which had failed to remove its "white" membership clause by July 1, 1966. This was a clear and undenied effort to punish the Louisiana Teachers Association which could not constitutionally vote on an amendment until November 1966. All efforts for further amendments to recognize this very real difficulty were defeated.

The next morning, July 2, the Executive Committee suspended the NEA affiliation of the Louisiana Teachers Association. The LTA was given until October 13, 1966 to show cause why this suspension should not be converted to expulsion and disaffiliation. Meanwhile NEA services and recognition of the LTA were to cease except on such special matters as might be authorized by the NEA President and the NEA Executive Secretary. It was later agreed that an inquiry should be held by a subcommittee meeting in New Orleans on October 3, 1966, to be followed by formal consideration by the entire Executive Committee on October 13.

When the Executive Committee met on October 13 the subcommittee had met in New Orleans with all parties concerned and recommended that the suspension of the LTA be placed "in abeyance" by the Executive Committee until the next annual meeting of the LTA on November 20-23, 1966. However, if the LTA Assembly failed to amend its Constitution so as to drop the white membership requirement, the LTA would be disaffiliated from the NEA on November 28, 1966 without further action by the Executive Committee. Fortunately the controversial member requirement was voted out of the LTA Constitution so the automatic disaffiliation did not occur and the organization retained its affiliation.

The new President of the NEA, Dr. Irvamae Applegate of Minnesota, was as reluctant as I was to see the *National* part of the NEA title diminished by the expulsion or withdrawal of state affiliates. She addressed herself with great patience, tact, and ingenuity to bringing about as rapid a compliance as possible with the spirit as well as the text of the NEA Resolution. On February 9, 1967 the Executive Committee agreed that the purpose of the Resolution was to bring about a merger of dual associations in each state. Questions about status, authority, and penalties thus became, quite properly, secondary and instrumental. Then on May 20, 1967 the Committee formally voted to find Louisiana was in compliance with the intent of the Resolution. So no one was expelled after all, but it was a close call.

1967

At the Representative Assembly in 1967 a full report on the progress of mergers was given. The resolution on desegregation in the public schools, around which so many arguments and parliamentary entanglements had been woven in the previous fourteen years, was adopted in 1967 without debate.

For me, the high point of the Convention came when President Applegate was given a plaque signed by the Presidents or Past Presidents of the twenty-two former NEA affiliates in the eleven southeastern states, praising her efforts to promote the mergers of the dual state associations.

The 1967 Convention was the last I served as Executive Secretary. The accompanying table shows the fluctuations in the time devoted to considering the integration resolutions in the business sessions of the Delegate Assembly, year by year.

TIME DEVOTED TO INTEGRATION RESOLUTION
in NEA Business Sessions, 1954 - 1967

Year	Place	Pages of stenotype record	Estimated time
1954	New York City	3	30 min.
1955	Chicago	4-½	45 min.
1956	Portland	-½	5 min.
1957	Philadelphia	5	50 min.
1958	Cleveland	4	40 min.
1959	St. Louis	17-½	2 hrs., 55 min.
1960	Los Angeles	21	3 hrs., 30 min.
1961	Atlantic City	18-½	3 hrs., 5 min.
1962	Denver	4	40 min.
1963	Detroit	23	3 hrs., 50 min.
1964	Seattle	16	2 hrs., 40 min.
1965	New York City	5	50 min.

1966	Miami Beach	18	3 hrs., 0 min.
1967	Minneapolis	-½	5 min.

NOTE: Proportion should be kept in mind in considering these figures. The NEA Business Sessions in these years met for an average of about 14 hours, of which almost exactly one-half was devoted to the consideration of formal Resolutions. The average Assembly devoted about 12 percent of its Business Sessions to the integration resolution, or about 24 percent of the time spent on formal Resolutions.

It would have been theoretically possible, by means of disaffiliation procedures, to have removed all segregated units by expulsion of the white affiliates, for the black affiliates, although they did not seek Caucasian participation, would not have denied it. Such expulsion, it seemed to me, would have been a mistake. As it was, I delivered to my successor a completely whole national association.

General observations and reflections

Except for the 1953 Delegate Assembly in Miami Beach, every Assembly that I served as Executive Secretary debated school integration topics every year. In general the debate was conducted with a high level of sincerity and in good spirits but almost every year the issues became sharper and the delegates more inclined to recriminations. The efforts to get "strong" integration resolutions did not, however, originate with the growing number of black delegates in attendance. The floor debates occurred almost entirely between northern whites and southern whites. However, in the late 'Sixties, towards the end of my Administration, the policy of "deliberate speed" became increasingly difficult to maintain.

The press

The education writers of the press corps at the NEA Convention were nearly all active in providing favorable publicity for integration, supplying its supporters with arguments, arranging full publicity for their remarks, and advising them on strategy to get the best news coverage. There remains no doubt in my mind that several of the nation's best-known education reporters regularly took partisan action in the debates in the NEA, rather than merely reporting them. Some people will applaud this partisanship; others will deplore it. I note it as a fact that had to be lived with.

One of the favorite questions to be tossed at me by the reporters at almost every NEA Convention was "How many Blacks are members of the NEA Executive Committee?" Of course, they knew the answer. The "story" the next day would say that the NEA Executive Secretary had at last been forced to admit under vigorous questioning that Blacks were excluded from the NEA's governing body. They didn't say that, apart from ex-officio members, only six members of the Executive Committee were elected and that in any case the Executive Committee was completely subordinate to the NEA Board of Directors, a much larger body, the membership of which included many black teachers. Belatedly, I found a way to make the reporters either honest or silent on this point. I said, "I will answer that question if you will quote me exactly: The number of Blacks on the Executive Committee of the NEA is exactly twice the number of Blacks on the Executive Committee of your Education Writers Association." I was never asked that question again. Even newspaper reporters know that twice zero is zero.

The NEA as a civil rights organization

There were members of the Association, and others external to it, who felt that the NEA should become, in effect, a civil rights organization. They wanted a more rapid, radical, and direct involvement of the NEA in every phase of the civil rights campaigns, whether or not such issues were directly linked to the schools.

The United States Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel, in an address at the 1963 NEA Convention in Detroit, furnished an excellent and distinguished example of a point of view about the role of the NEA with which I was in disagreement. His statement was, I feel quite sure, carefully prepared and I know from listening to it that it was very eloquently delivered. He began by a series of statistical contrasts: for example, while eleven percent of the total population was black, only 3.5 percent of all professional workers were black. This and similar statistical evidence revealed, he said, a long-continued and purposeful discrimination in educational opportunity. It was unfortunate, he added, that the solution of this problem had been left to the legal profession and the Courts. The teaching profession should have taken the lead in "creative action" to deal with this issue of public policy. He did not, however, describe "creative action" in precise terms.

A year later the Commissioner returned to the same subject with even greater vigor. He told the Assembly of the NEA in 1964: "I say that the war against segregation is education's war, that it is a single war." Towards the end of his address, Commissioner Keppel said, "*Essential to our success in the years ahead is a working partnership between education and the civil rights movement.*"

It is difficult to disagree with a position so ably stated from so high a source. Nevertheless, I did disagree and still do. I felt that the NEA should not dissipate its limited energies over the whole broad front of civil rights. I believed that although civil rights in American education was a highly important issue, it was not the sole issue, or an issue on which teachers could be or should be the chief arbiters. I agreed that teachers had a great responsibility in those aspects of civil rights which were clearly and closely related to the conduct of education. But I did not believe that it was the duty of teachers *as such* to concentrate their entire professional efforts on that single topic. And I believe very firmly and with good reason that progress in civil rights in education depended on *timing.* Issues and policies which were doomed to failure and to increase and aggravate existing differences at one moment could be achieved by patient and persistent effort applied at strategically productive moments.

Many thoughtful and able members of the NEA, however, felt exactly as Commissioner Keppel did. They regarded the NEA policies as timid and ineffective. They heard an inner voice crying out for vengeance and they deeply yearned to make the white southern members "toe the line." I felt, however, that a united teaching profession would help, as few other groups could do, to maintain the greatest possible unity, coherence, and strength of the nation.

This, it seems to me still, was not an unworthy or insignificant purpose. A major southern white secession from the NEA would have been an irreversible calamity. Such a disaster was possible on several occasions. Once such a secession occurred, the road back to unity would have been very long–perhaps endless. Had a major white southern secession occurred in the 1950's or early 1960's, we would certainly have seen the emergence and prospering of another national teachers' organization, based in the south, but successfully seeking members everywhere (at least as far north as Boston), issuing its own publications, holding its own conferences, supporting its own state and national legislative programs, with a racially based, racially biased, states' rights, backlash policy. The recent cooling of interest in integration for its own sake and the rising interest in better education for all children suggests that decisions made in terms of momentary advantage may later seem less attractive.

The chief drive for instant integration in teachers' organizations was spearheaded in the NEA mainly by white members from the northern and western states. This was especially true of the efforts to set precise deadlines for merger and to provide for the disaffiliation of local and state units not in compliance by dates determined and announced in advance. This is not to say that the black members were hostile or indifferent to the merger ideal; they were on the whole, however, less peremptory and less punitive.

It is highly doubtful whether a more "tough" stand by the NEA could have significantly hastened the processes of integration and racial justice. It is certain in my view that such a policy *in those years* would have irrevocably split the Association. As it was, the Association remained a powerful force for securing equal opportunity in education. That, it seemed to me, was its primary responsibility.

There were, of course, many other events during these years which involved difficult decisions–the unsuccessful but vigorous efforts of the Attorney General of Louisiana in 1961 to prevent teachers in that state from joining NEA; the reinstatement in Little Rock of teachers who had been unjustly dismissed because of their efforts to minimize the local school disorders of 1958; the reopening of public schools in Prince Edward County, Virginia; the calls for NEA participation in various demonstrations and marches only tangentially related to education–to cite only a few examples.

Without having (or desiring to have) absolute or ultimate authority in these or other NEA policies, I nevertheless used the considerable power of my office to advance the two principles to which I have already referred. In short, one might say, I suppose, that I tried with some success to move the Association "forward together" and with "deliberate speed."

17 Independence of the Teaching Profession

The union shop in Butte - The "company union" resolution - New York City - The decision to compete - New York: the campaign - Lessons from New York - Looking for help - The turning point - Militant sanctions - Utah - Oklahoma - Why the teachers were angry - What the teachers want

The American Federation of Teachers (AFT), a part of the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO, was established in the 1920's. For the next four decades it was a minor irritant to the NEA. As a possible competitor with the NEA, the AFT could not be taken seriously. It received little support from the AFL, to which it was originally and closely affiliated. The American Federation of Labor, although it was firmly and historically devoted to the improvement of educational opportunity, demonstrated no serious or sustained interest in unionizing the public school teachers.

Mr. James Crabtree, a former Executive Secretary of the NEA, once told me that he felt he had an informal understanding with William Green, President of the AFL. I do not recall the exact terms of this agreement. I think Mr. Crabtree gave general support to some legislation favored by the unions while Mr. Green refrained from a major effort to unionize the nation's teachers.

For whatever reason, the teachers' union did not prosper. In a few cities it obtained some status and membership but nationally it was unimportant. It did, however, place obstacles in the path of the NEA international efforts by tactics which I have described in preceding chapters.

The union shop in Butte

In 1956 the first small cloud appeared. In Butte, Montana, the local school board, in a new master contract with the local AFT unit, gave the AFT the status of a union shop in the public schools. The provisions of the new contract applied only to union members. All new Butte teachers must agree to join the union as a condition of their employment. Salary increments were payable only to union members. To other teachers, no matter how long and excellent their service, the contract denied salary increments.

The ensuing litigation reached the State Supreme Court in 1959. On June 29 the Court voted 3-2 that "the Union security clause is void and illegal." The NEA furnished legal advice and funds to argue this case. The majority decision of the Court stated that if the Butte School Board could grant or deny salary increments to teachers on account of their membership in a labor union, it could apply the same powers to pressure teachers to join a certain lodge, church, or political party.

The "company union" resolution

While the Butte case was plodding through hearings and appeals, another disturbing event took place. The 1957 AFL-CIO Convention passed a surprise resolution attacking the NEA. Teachers in most American communities, the resolution said, are being exploited without redress. The NEA, they argued, is a company union which cannot meet the needs of teachers.

I issued an immediate rejoinder stating accurately that the resolution had been engineered by some members of the AFT. I said that the term "company union," which the resolution used in a highly pejorative sense, was misleading when applied to the National Education Association and its affiliates. "Public schools," I said, "are not a company; they are a government service; they are not operated for profit." I compared the NEA membership of 704,000 to the 50,000 claimed members in AFT—a ratio of better than fourteen to one. I pointed out that although the NEA was open to all professionals in education, 70 percent of the delegates in its highest governing body, the Representative Assembly, were classroom teachers. I also reminded the leaders of AFL-CIO that the NEA had on many occasions worked closely and effectively with labor unions as well as with parents, business, agriculture, veterans, and other civic organizations. These cooperative arrangements would continue because the independent, professional status of teaching carries with it no implications of hostility toward other groups.

"Those other powerful organizations in American life which oppose both the NEA and organized labor on such vital questions as federal and state support of public education" would, I said, be delighted by the prospect of dividing our forces.

In 1960 it became clear that a major drive generously financed by the AFL-CIO would be launched, city by city, to get the teachers' union recognized as the voice of the profession on all matters affecting salaries, working conditions, and educational policy.

The unionizing campaign was launched in New York City. In 1959 it became apparent that the local AFT union was spending more money for organizing purposes than would be normal for a local organization of its size and status.

It appeared clear to me at that time that the leaders of organized labor had decided on an all-out campaign which would, if successful, profoundly modify the structure of American education. I perceived the affiliation of teachers' organizations with organized labor as a serious threat to the integrity of the educational process. I believe that events since then have provided enough illustrations of the reality of this danger. I shall give just one example.

New York City

Shortly after the teachers' union took over the New York City schools, the city school board, substantially in reaction to the pressure of the union (and contrary to the advice of the corporation counsel) disapproved the purchase by the school system of two well-known encyclopedias and about 170 other titles solely because one manufacturer, in one stage of the preparation of these books, was involved in a protracted and still unresolved labor dispute. No question was raised about the accuracy or usefulness of these books. The Board's ruling, as the *New York Times* commented, was clearly taken for one reason only—"to pander to the Union demands." Political power and organized pressure had emerged completely triumphant over sound educational policy and professional responsibility. By accepting the support of the central labor council, by voting themselves into a junior partnership with organized labor, the New York City teachers had given up the right to share in the selection of books for their students. They were no longer responsible to the entire community, to their pupils, to standards of scholarship. These ideals were irrelevant. The one thing that did matter was that these books were on a union blacklist and the teachers' professional integrity had to bow before that dictum.

I never thought that the issue which occupied a substantial part of my attention between 1960 and 1967 was whether the initials of the major national teachers' organization would be NEA or AFT. I did not think that the struggle was merely a competition for members, or a contest for power between rival organizations, or a question of whether teachers and school administrators should belong to the same organization, or even a matter of the relative emphasis which a professional organization should devote to teacher welfare versus improved service to society. I thought, and still think, that the basic question was the relation of the teaching profession to society—either remaining an independent self-governing profession, or becoming a subsidiary of one of the many segments of American life to be used as a weapon in economic and political struggles.

One of the unique characteristics of the New York City school system in 1960 was that its teachers had no relationship to the New York State Education Association. Because of this apparently mutually-accepted oddity, state and national membership programs had not been carried out in New York City for years. Most New York City teachers knew of the NEA only in a vague way as "some kind of national study group," as one New Yorker phrased it. There were in the city more than 100 teacher organizations of which a few maintained a listless affiliation with NEA. They generally felt that New York was self-sufficient and NEA assistance was rarely requested.

When in late 1959 it first became apparent that the AFT, through its local New York affiliate, was organizing with increasing effectiveness and momentum, five of the NEA affiliates in the city, and four other influential New York City teacher groups arranged to meet in Washington in May, 1960, to discuss their common problems. Impetus for this meeting came from the New York City

NEA Council, a local organization of NEA members formed with NEA help in 1958. At that time NEA had only about 700 members among the city's 50,000 school employees. The consensus of this group was that some form of negotiation between the teachers and the Board of Education must be their common goal. The labor forces in the city were already pressing hard for collective bargaining and the group in Washington believed that the great majority of New York City teachers favored this arrangement. These New York City leaders then urgently requested direct NEA assistance to help them combat the union drive. None of these New York City teacher groups was hostile to the labor movement in general. They recognized that organized labor had made many significant contributions to American society. But they believed also that the teaching profession could best be served by an independent organization not directly related to any single economic segment or power-bloc.

The decision to compete

When this New York City request was transmitted to the NEA Executive Committee in June 1960, the decision was affirmative. It was decided to render this assistance through a regional office in New York City, in line with the current NEA program of extending increasing assistance through regional offices. The Association already had established an NEA information-publicity office in the Time-Life Building and the Regional Office for New York was also installed there in January 1961.

The regional office staff soon discovered the existence of a large number of New York City educational organizations, many of which were decaying. Some of them had probably been vigorous and representative, but deterioration had set in due to inadequate rotation of leadership and failure to recruit and retain the interest of the new, younger teachers. These groups were contemptuously referred to by the Union as "paper" organizations–meaning that their main visible activity was issuing an occasional leaflet or press release.

What was even worse, these organizations had, over the years, fallen into squabbles among themselves. Bristling hostilities existed for which no one living could recall the origin. Leaders of Organization A would not meet with those from Organization B. Both groups, however, were willing to talk separately to the NEA local representative. The personal and minor hostilities were in this clumsy manner allayed.

A major continuing factor of disunity was disagreement over salary policy, with high school teachers (mostly men) seeking higher pay, while elementary school teachers (mostly women) defended the equal pay arrangements which had been won in 1947. Meanwhile the overtures to the teachers from the AFT were apparently guided by the principle (if principle is the right word) of promising anything to anybody provided that the Union was installed as their bargaining agent.

In the end, the NEA affiliates developed a reasonable compromise among the embattled organizations. This agreement, in turn, had a favorable impact on the New York City teachers themselves. The Union response was to attack the good faith of all the organizations involved and to circulate misinformation about the nature of the compromise.

Hostility to the NEA was generated by reports about various alleged misdeeds of the Association in years past. Jewish teachers were still calling the Association anti-Semitic because it had conducted, five years before, a Near East tour in which five teachers of the Jewish faith were given alternative itineraries when Syria would not issue tourist visas to them. Even though NEA had protested and withdrawn all its tours from the offending countries, the Jewish teachers in New York City were still hostile. Catholic teachers were not allowed to forget that the NEA had been condemned by Catholic clergy and press for opposing state and federal funds for parochial schools. Black teachers were continually reminded that NEA still had some segregated affiliates in parts of the south.

In June 1961, the New York City teachers voted 27,000 to 9,000 in favor of holding an election to select an organization for collective bargaining purposes. About 9,000 teachers failed to vote. The vote to hold an election required the NEA to make, almost at once, an exceedingly difficult decision. Should NEA adopt a hands-off policy because of the danger of wasting time and money on a probable loss? Or should the Association help to form a coalition of non-union local associations and help this coalition in its campaign? For two major reasons we selected the second option. If we did not participate there would have been no substantial opposition to the Union. Yet the Union would nevertheless be sure to claim that it had defeated the NEA. The

381

second reason was the fact that the majority of the city's teachers did not belong to the AFT local; hence, it was just possible that providing an active and unified alternative to the AFT might create a majority vote against the Union.

New York: the campaign

After days of negotiating, the NEA staff succeeded in bringing about the formation of the Teachers Bargaining Organization (TBO). The NEA supplied staff for field spokespersons and for publicity. We had two and one-half months to develop contact with each of the New York City schools and to speak to the teaching staff. The NEA field staff spoke for the TBO in about 780 out of the city's 860 schools. This remarkable achievement was made possible by the use of staff on loan from the state associations of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Ohio, Illinois, and Michigan. This borrowing of personnel, although an excellent sign of solidarity and concern, was not an ideal procedure. The borrowed staff was assigned to New York City for only a few weeks or even for a few days; they could not instantly be at home in an unfamiliar setting. Speaking engagements could be arranged at schools on only two occasions; the lunch break or immediately after school closed. The problems of travel within the city were also a severe handicap.

The AFT, of course, encountered somewhat the same obstacles. However, it did not encounter the same sabotage as did the TBO spokespersons. One of the sabotage procedures worked as follows: After considerable telephoning, a TBO representative would be given an opportunity to speak at a certain school on a certain date. The day before a telephone call would be received, ostensibly from the school, stating that it had been necessary to postpone the meeting by one day. Could the TBO representative come one day later than originally planned? If the representative agreed and went to the school on the second date a group of irate teachers would be on hand indignantly accusing the representative of failure to keep the original appointment.

In spite of such dubious tactics, 10,000 signatures asking that TBO be placed on the ballot were collected, although only 4,300 signatures were actually required.

In addition to personal contacts, a biweekly newsletter was issued. An advertising program was conducted on the school page of the *New York World-Telegram and Sun*, the most widely read school news medium for the city's teachers. A personal telephone campaign was also conducted as well as spot announcements about TBO on public affairs radio programs.

The forces against which the NEA team was contending were formidable. New York City is often and correctly characterized as a "union town." The political influence of City Hall caused, among other unfavorable circumstances a speedup of the election schedule, limiting the time in which the TBO could establish its identity and present its goals. The City Administration was grateful for the support Labor had given to the political election campaign. The Mayor saved "face" for the teachers' union in its abortive "strike" in November 1960, by granting amnesty to the strikers and by failing to invoke the state laws regarding strikes by public employees. Orders from the City School Administration forbade school principals and all administrators from taking any part in the campaign, thus minimizing any leadership that NEA members in these groups could exert.

The City Labor Department efforts included an attempt to rule the TBO petition forms invalid and the withholding until the last moment of a final date for the mailing of ballots. Several categories of nonsupervisory personnel, many of whom were career teachers and who favored TBO, were ruled ineligible to vote because, it was said, their work was "specialized." Union members who ran the teachers' committees in some schools resisted or evaded efforts to arrange meetings for TBO spokespersons and even withheld TBO campaign material from teachers, who, they feared, might be influenced by exposure to it.

Neither the Union nor the NEA had ever mustered a substantial membership in this unique, self-centered, and self-sufficient metropolis. The leadership of the teachers of New York City, whether in the teachers' union or in the NEA affiliate, was on the whole the worst I have ever encountered. There were a few notable exceptions, but most New York City teachers *who attained positions of leadership* among their colleagues were, in my experience, loud, vulgar, irritable, and very strongly motivated in terms of personal and political advantage. Of course the large majority of teachers, in New York City as elsewhere, do not fit the above description.

The election results showed that many nonunion members would vote for Union representation both because of loyalty to the labor movement in general and because the Union so clearly had the support of the city Administration. The voting results, in round numbers, were as follows:

For representation by the Union	20,000
For representation by the TBO	10,000
For representation by other organizations	2,500
Not voting	11,000
Total eligible voters	43,500

The resources expended by the AFT to achieve its objectives in New York City alone amounted to about a half-million dollars. I obtained this figure from one of the Vice-Presidents of the AFL-CIO. We were both attending a luncheon and were amicably discussing the outcome of the New York City election. I remarked, and my companion readily agreed, that the teachers' union of New York City could not possibly have financed such an extensive campaign. I said that the teachers' union must have had available about $90,000 for the purpose. This was a pure, but not guileless, guess on my part. My luncheon companion responded immediately that the actual sum was about $500,000. Besides this substantial cash assistance, the AFT local in New York City received, he told me, various kinds of help from the Auto Workers, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, the Ladies' Garment Workers, the Machinists, and other unions.

Lessons from New York

The loss of the election in New York City was no great disaster to the National Education Association, I felt, at least not in quantity or quality of members. The defeat was, however, a loss in prestige and an evidence of vulnerability. I was, moreover, quite sure now that New York was the first engagement in what would be a long war. I, therefore, placed before the next meeting of the NEA Board of Directors, in February 1962, *first,* a detailed, and (as far as I could make it) an objective account of the events in New York City, and *second,* a series of recommendations to reorganize the National Education Association for meeting the challenge. These recommendations included the provision of further services to urban members and affiliates; the development of local negotiating agreements, a more efficient structure for the National Education Association itself; and improved communication with the members. I urged an entirely new pattern for the Annual Convention, with several days set aside for the consideration in depth of the most important educational developments and issues; this to be followed by a business meeting of the Representative Assembly which would consider the activities of the Association without interruption or distraction.

The NEA, I felt, should avoid even the appearance of a hostile attitude towa[illegible]ganized labor. An official statement on this point was approved in these terms: "NEA policy toward organized labor in general, as to other civic and economic groups, is one of continued and cordial readiness to cooperate in all worthy efforts to improve educational opportunity and to elevate the status and welfare of the teaching profession."

The Board of Directors voted that each state affiliate in 1962 should set up enough regional forums so that substantially all members could attend a forum on a drive-in-and-back-the-same-day-basis. The forum should last four to six hours; it should clarify the basic reasons why an independent professional organization is better for education and better for teachers in the United States than a trade union; it should deal intensively with the programs and activities of the state and national associations. If necessary, these forums should replace, or utilize, other scheduled group meetings on less urgent topics.

The Board also voted that the local affiliates in every city over 100,000 population should hold a similar but more extensive workshop of at least two days, attended by at least one person from every school building in the city.

The state and local affiliates were urged to take immediate steps to convene these meetings. The state affiliates, in addition, were urged to secure state legislation to give effect to the NEA policy on professional negotiations. The NEA policy of an all-inclusive organization at local, state, and national levels was reaffirmed.

In the next few years one of my principal problems was to prod the state and local education associations to act. In many cases I was unsuccessful. Officers of the affiliated associations believed (and often said) that what had happened in New York City would not affect their areas. Many ignored the warnings and failed to act upon the advice of the NEA Board of Directors in this matter. Some even said that it was a tactical error to consider the "union problem" at all. Such discussions, they said, simply put a lot of bad ideas into the heads of teachers who would not otherwise have thought of the matter and that we should not give the AFT "free advertising" by talking about it.

My proposals for a smaller Representative Assembly, followed or preceded by conventions devoted to general professional questions, was referred to various committees, and, in effect, delayed until it lost the name of action. My proposal that the NEA Department of Classroom Teachers become the unit of the Association which would be concerned solely with salaries and working conditions, that the Department be relieved of all other responsibilities, and that it become, in effect, the voice of the classroom teacher on these matters was referred to a committee and "sunk without trace."

Looking for help

The Association thus faced the teachers' union in representation elections in city after city, without any fundamental change in its structure and strategy for dealing with such challenges. The Association, often by a painfully narrow margin, lost many of these elections. The teachers' union was recognized by the Board of Education as the representative of teachers in Boston, Baltimore, Washington, Chicago, Detroit and other cities. Only when this trend became clearly visible to anyone without a blindfold was I able to secure serious but belated attention to the teachers' union challenge on the part of many of the affiliated state education associations.

My friends in positions of academic leadership, the college and university presidents, the officials of the great foundations, the deans and professors in schools of education, and many of the superintendents of schools were also generally unconcerned about this issue. Nor did I find it easier to evoke interest or assistance among the general public than I did among the academic and administrative leadership of the profession.

I would like to note two exceptions to this general lack of concern among members of the general public. One of these was the national leadership of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers (the PTA), especially during the several years when it was led by its President, Mrs. Clifford Jenkins of New York.

An extremely valued friend in my rather lonely efforts to preserve the independence of the teaching profession was Frank Pace, a public-spirited citizen who had served our country as

Secretary of the Army and, later, as the head of General Dynamics Corporation. We were both in Palo Alto for a meeting of the Board of Visitors of the Stanford School of Education when I told Frank Pace of my concern. At that point in the conversation most people begin to look for the exit, but Mr. Pace surprised me by his instant grasp of the immense importance of the issue. When others shrugged their shoulders and changed the subject, Frank Pace said, "That's really important! How can I help?" He found time in a very heavy schedule to keep in touch with the developing problem, to offer valuable and practical suggestions, and to take action which assisted me. For that I am most grateful. I remember this help all the more appreciatively because his positive response was almost unique among those of the many other citizens to whom I turned in vain.

The turning point

By the summer of 1962 I decided that I must place my deep concern before the largest NEA official body to which I was ultimately responsible. That body was the Representative Assembly which met in Denver that year and to which I gave a report called "The Turning Point."

I said that the NEA had reached a point of crisis in its long history. This new crisis had two main aspects: (1) the growth of cities and suburbs which had created problems for which the local education associations were, save for a few exceptions, inadequately prepared; and (2) national leaders of organized labor had decided to use their considerable economic resources and political power to affiliate all public school teachers, beginning with those of the large cities.

I was well aware that the role of Cassandra, prophesying woe, is not usually well-received. I also believed that the NEA did not employ an Executive Secretary to give soothing or soporific reports to the Delegate Assembly. So I plunged on.

I asked why the AFL-CIO, after decades of cooperation with the NEA, had suddenly moved in on the teaching profession. Union membership, I pointed out, had been declining at the rate of about 140,000 members per year since 1956. Many union leaders had decided that the white collar workers—office employees in the main—must be enlisted in order to continue to serve the labor movement properly. It appeared to them, perhaps, that

387

teaching was a practically undefended gateway to this wider objective. If so, labor has by this time discovered that teaching is not really the gateway and that it was not as defenseless as it may have seemed.

Some people argued that organized labor had been such a steadfast supporter of the public schools that it is only sporting of teachers to reciprocate by affiliating with labor. It did not seem to me, however, that organized labor could reasonably claim the control of the teaching profession as a prize for acting in the best interests of its own union members.

The NEA, I said, must be highly flexible as to procedures and very firm as to principles. Four of these principles must be restated as often as necessary:

1. The NEA is a *professional* association. Its members put the welfare of students above all other considerations. Even when the Association defends the rights and interests of the teaching profession, it will do so in a manner calculated to improve the quality of the educational service.
2. The NEA is an *inclusive* organization. Teachers and administrators are colleagues. They do not occupy a master-and-servant relationship. They are jointly concerned about the quality of education.
3. The NEA is a *democratic* organization. Issues are settled by informed voting on the merits of each case. Each member, no matter what is her or his special position, has one voice and one vote,—never more, never less.
4. The NEA is an *independent* organization. The difference between being an independent agency and being a branch of organized labor is not superficial. The personnel in education should not be affiliated to any one segment of the population. This is particularly true in the case of labor affiliation, for organized labor has policies and objectives related to a variety of highly controversial general public issues and advances its policies by definite political alliances and commitments.

To school boards, I said that they could not meet their responsibilities by ignoring the substantial differences between an independent teaching profession and a relatively small branch of the vast labor movement; or by calling down an impartial plague on both houses. I said that many hundreds of school boards found it appropriate to establish close cooperation with the Chamber of Commerce and yet give no recognition to labor and other groups. This partiality, I said, was deplorable.

I warned school boards that they were going to experience some difficulties in working with their employees. I advised them to follow the professional route not because it would be easy but because it is right. I said to parents, school board members, and other citizens:

> "The members of the National Education Association, whatever others may do, will constantly strive to improve their qualifications and the quality of the service they render; they will keep their pledged word; and *they will never walk out on the students in their charge!"*

At this point, I was startled and surprised by an outbreak of enthusiastic and prolonged applause. I have since discovered that such fervent and general applause was not to become a lasting guide to the viewpoint of American teachers. But while it lasted I felt very pleased. However, a survey taken in 1970 by the NEA Research Division showed that by that time 73 percent of the nation's public school teachers said they would approve teachers' strikes under certain circumstances. Even then, however, 63 percent of the teachers said they would endorse strikes "only under extreme conditions" while only ten percent approved strikes by teachers "the same as other employees." The number of teacher strikes grew from twelve in the school year 1964-65 to 180 in 1969-70 and the number of teachers involved rose from 15,000 to 118,000.

I urged organized labor itself to reflect on its position vis-a-vis the NEA. Over 90 percent of the nation's teachers, I said, are committed to local, state, or national professional organizations. The labor movement, if it spends enough money, can enrol some teachers in limited areas where emergency or unusual circumstances exist. The utmost the unionized teachers can attain nationally is to claim a somewhat larger minority than it has in the past. This achievement will be financially costly and dangerous to the labor movement. Most educators currently regard organized labor in general with goodwill. They appreciate and welcome the cooperation of labor in improving the financial basis of public education. The teachers know that if organized business had given the schools the same kind of support that organized labor has given, the financial basis of public education would be immensely improved. The labor movement could derive much advantage from a strong independent teaching profession. But surely the way to create a strong teaching profession is not to liquidate the NEA, the largest and most powerful such organization in the free world.

I recalled that organized labor and the NEA had worked effectively together on school finance, federal aid legislation, and child welfare laws. Does labor, I asked, wish to consign this effective teamwork to the junkheap? Are huge expenditures to take over a small part of the teaching profession the most productive way to the funds of the American union member? Is it good for American labor to incur the hostility of most of the teachers of the country?

Labor's answer to these rhetorical questions of mine was, as it turned out, a resounding "Yes!". I still think I had a good point and I am glad I did my obviously inadequate best to present it persuasively.

For the NEA delegates themselves, I ended with several specific suggestions:

1. Strengthen your local association by giving younger members a chance to participate, by defining a few specific aims, and by adequately financing it.
2. Start at once to develop a written agreement with the local school board. We should have 5,000 written professional negotiation agreements in effect within the next twelve months.
3. Be sure you know the crucial difference between a professional association and a teachers' union and can tell concisely why the former is better. Learn this before you leave Denver.
4. Explain the issue to your colleagues at home, and, as far as possible, to citizens generally.
5. Each state should develop a timetable for achievement of unified local, state, and national membership with a unified schedule of membership services to be provided at each level.
6. Concentrate on a few of the most important things that we can nearly all agree to. A sure way for a majority to

become a minority is to be loud and clear with regard to what it opposes and doubtful and obscure about what it supports.

Militant sanctions

Meanwhile the effort to make the NEA more militant rolled steadily onward. It was a process which began long before the AFL-CIO challenge, but I believe the competition from the teachers' union accelerated the long-range trend. I shall give a few illustrations.

Utah

In Salt Lake City, March 16, 1963 was a very cold morning following a heavy statewide snowfall. Nevertheless over 8,000 members of the Utah Education Association (about 80 percent of the total state UEA membership) gathered in the state's capital city. Calmly, after a full debate, a vote by secret ballot supported a proposal to refrain from discussing next year's contracts until a solution was found to the state school finance problem. The vote on this issue was more than 40 to 1.

A standard procedure to follow in such cases had already been developed and approved by the NEA Board of Directors. This procedure involved first an investigation by a committee established by the NEA Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities and a report of its investigation to the NEA Executive Committee for action. In this investigating committee it was standard practice to include several outstanding and widely-respected citizens from outside the teaching profession.

While this process was being followed the NEA gave immediate national publicity to the Utah situation and allocated expert legal assistance and substantial funds to help make the UEA position clear to the citizens of Utah. The UEA officers were flown to Washington for consultation in mid-April after which the NEA advised all its members that any contracts offered them in Utah might well be positions to which Utah teachers hoped and expected to return.

I myself went to Salt Lake City to try very respectfully to impress on Governor Clyde the gravity of the teachers' dissatisfaction and the possibility of national sanctions against the entire state of Utah. After extended discussion, Governor Clyde agreed to appoint an impartial citizens' committee to study and report to him and to the public on the state's school finances. The teachers, thus reassured, resumed negotiations on salaries for 1964-65.

On May 13, 1964, the Governor's Citizens' Committee made an interim report. Its findings closely paralleled those of the NEA's own investigations. The Governor's Citizens' Committee concluded that about $6 million in additional school revenue was needed for the 1964-65 school year and recommended that the Governor call a special session of the Utah state legislature to deal with this problem. The Committee divided the funds needed as follows:

$ 700,000	for improved school library services
$2,000,000	to employ additional teachers and other school personnel and to buy additional school supplies and equipment
$3,000,000	for teachers' salary increases on a "selective" basis, such as for teachers with post-graduate training and degrees

The Governor then rejected out of hand the findings of his own citizens' committee. He even refused to call the Legislature into session so that the representatives of the citizens of the state could examine his own citizens' committee findings.

Three days later, the House of Delegates of the UEA called on the UEA members to take a two-day recess so as to convene a meeting of all Utah teachers to consider the situation. The House also formally requested the NEA to invoke national sanctions immediately. On May 19, the NEA Executive Committee approved a sanction statement requesting members of the teaching profession throughout the nation to refrain from seeking or accepting employment in Utah.

Those sanctions stayed in force for almost a year. Many things happened in that year. Many other things did not happen. There was no action by teachers to halt the education of Utah boys and girls. Nothing was done to impair the image of the teacher as a responsible professional in the eyes of the public or the students. The national sanctions, the Governor's intransigence, and a steady publicity campaign combined to shock the people of Utah into action.

These citizens elected a new Governor and a new Legislature. The Legislature provided $10 million more for the public schools at once and $15 million more for the next year. The new funds were spent to extend school library services, to give further attention to exceptional children, and to improve teachers' salaries.

The success of the NEA sanctions in Utah had an almost instantly visible effect on other states, particularly on those adjacent or nearby. In Idaho, conditions in education had been even worse than in Utah. No doubt the experience of their neighbor to the south was noted by Idaho officials. The Governor and the Legislature of Idaho increased state school support by nearly 42 percent in the 1965 legislative session. Arizona avoided a "Utah-type crisis" and adopted a $19 million state school equalization program—a goal of the Arizona Education Association for two decades. Major breakthroughs in state school finance were recorded at about the same time in South Dakota, Indiana, Kentucky, Washington, West Virginia, Arkansas, and Texas.

Oklahoma

In Oklahoma, early in 1965, an investigation by NEA showed steadily deteriorating school conditions over many years. This richly endowed and prosperous state had for at least ten years been receiving far better educational service than it was paying for. Many elementary school classes of 35, 40, even 50 pupils were discovered. In spite of a so-called free textbook law, the state was actually paying only half of the cost of elementary textbooks. Few teachers had any sick leave protection. Special education in Oklahoma was so neglected that, for example, only four percent of the blind and partially-sighted pupils had been placed in classes properly equipped to help them. Teachers were carrying excessive loads of clerical and extracurricular duties with a resulting shortage of time to prepare the regular daily classroom instruction.

On May 3, 1965, the National Education Association announced severe sanctions on the public schools of Oklahoma. They included *censure* through wide public notice concerning the state's subminimal schools, especially in media which would warn industry and business to think twice before locating in Oklahoma; *notification* of unsatisfactory school conditions to placement and certification services; *warning* to NEA members, active or student, not currently employed in Oklahoma, that acceptance of employment in Oklahoma might be considered unethical conduct; and *assistance* to teachers presently employed in Oklahoma who might wish to leave the state. These sanctions were not removed until an all-time high record of $28.7 million for public schools had been enacted by the previously apathetic Legislature and after the people of Oklahoma adopted a referendum to permit local school districts to increase school support. In addition to substantial salary improvements, the Legislature funded an expanded genuinely-free textbook program, employment of counselors and psychologists in the public schools, and increased retirement, social security, and sick leave benefits.

Thus the use of statewide sanctions proved highly successful in Utah and Oklahoma. I believe continued use of this strategy would have been equally, or more, effective. There was a body of opinion among some of the NEA leaders which found sanctions too cumbersome and therefore favored strike action by teachers.

A strike is a concerted, unilateral suspension of services, wholly or primarily for the economic advantage of the teacher. Although I would not say that teachers should never strike under any imaginable set of conditions, the use of a strike, especially when such action is contrary to law or to court order, is profoundly wrong. I believe that teachers should never fail to carry out contracts which they have accepted. Teachers should not walk out on the students in their classes. Strikes by teachers without very careful deliberation and before all alternatives have been tried, will impair and ultimately destroy the confidence and respect of the public. And if and when public confidence and respect are lost, the American public schools and American life in general will have lost something precious, irreplaceable, and almost surely irretrievable.

I am ruefully aware that these views are not those of the majority of teachers today.

Why the Teachers Were Angry

The causes of the recent growth of militancy among teachers could be first noticed in the 1940's. They became increasingly evident during the next thirty years.

1. Teachers are better educated. The typical classroom teacher has nearly five years of post-secondary educa-

tion—a dramatic shift from the once-dominant two-year normal school training.

2. Teachers are more fully and effectively organized. Lacking power to improve school conditions by acting alone, members of the profession have turned to group representation in order to share in decisions affecting their service.
3. The teaching profession in all of its branches—teaching, supervision, and administration—is more insistent than ever on professional salaries to release educators from economic humiliation and moonlighting, and to provide conditions of work which allow them to operate at full potential.
4. The teaching profession has grown younger. And young teachers, in general, are increasingly impatient. They are not content to wait for old age. They want action. As youth has always done, the new recruits in the profession are questioning the values and procedures of their elders. They are willing to take chances if they think they can also make progress.
5. Finally, one must include among the causes of militancy a number of small indignities unrelated to income. Let me give a few examples.

Example 1. Until recently a teacher who was registered in a late afternoon or evening college class, to study a subject important to that teacher's work, could not claim tuition or other related expense as an income tax deduction. An attorney or physician could attend a meeting of the American Bar Association or the American Medical Association in London or Hawaii and the full cost of that experience was normally claimed and rarely questioned as a professional expense. It took the combined efforts of the National Education Association and a few sturdy allies *years*—many years—to get a similar recognition for the expenses of the primary school teacher who took a course on her or his own time in, say, remedial reading at a nearby college. And even when we got the ruling there were more years of squabbling with the Internal Revenue Service before the ruling was applied with reasonable consistency.

> *Example 2.* Examine the standard plot and action of one of the many "Doctor" dramas on television. They usually contain at least one operating room scene per episode. Dr. Kiley or Dr. Casey, or Dr. Welby, or Dr. Kildare is scrubbed, gloved, gowned and ready, with patient before him and operating room nurse at his side. Lights! Camera! Action! Doctor holds out his hand and says, "Scalpel!" and the nurse says, "Doctor, you can only get them on Thursday morning!" Or perhaps the surgeon says, "Sponge!" The nurse replies, "You sent the requisition in time and in triplicate but somebody sent us splints by mistake." Or Dr. Welby says, "Sutures!" and the nurse says gently, "Dr. Casey is using sutures just now. Shall I put you on the list for tomorrow?"

Teachers want their equipment and supplies on hand when the moment comes to use them. Few, if any, teachers have this privilege as a matter of guaranteed routine. Teachers want to spend more time teaching. They want supporting services for children with special needs, up-to-date teaching materials. But as of now not one in a hundred gets these necessities until somebody shrieks and pounds on a table.

One of the ironies of this petty frustration is the fact that the needed material is usually quite inexpensive. It is not usually made hard-to-get in order to save money; it occurs because a maddening bureaucracy, that doesn't trust teachers much anyway, cannot and will not shake itself loose from the accumulated spiderwebs of tradition and suspicion.

Much has been done in recent years to ease these petty annoyances to which working teachers have been so needlessly required to submit. But frustration often remains some time after its original causes have been removed. No grievance is so keenly felt as one which has been *almost*, but not quite fully, redressed.

What the Teachers Want

The teaching profession of the United States is determined to have a role in defining the conditions under which its services to the community may be provided. Teachers insist upon a greater opportunity to apply their skills to the solution of human problems in the light of their firsthand knowledge of those problems. They also want the recognition which their training, experience, and skill abundantly justify. The basic decision has been made. It will not be reversed.

We may also hope that teachers will, with growing frequency, apply their new-found militancy to other aspects of the school system which limit the effectiveness of education. I believe that we shall see more teacher militancy with regard to the size of classes–not that teachers may have an easier job but that children may receive more attention to individual needs.

The teachers are likely to become militant about security. While I was at the NEA a California teacher was being tormented by a right-wing group because she was trying to develop the ability of her students to think independently about controversial issues. When the children collected trick-or-treat parcels at Halloween, they found some of the candy wrapped in little mimeographed pieces of paper containing a scurrilous attack on this teacher's integrity. A student in her classroom was found with a hollowed-out textbook in which a tape recorder was concealed. The recorder was in operation and was designed to make a surreptitious recording of everything she said–to be played back at some other time. This teacher reluctantly decided to fight her detractors in the courts. Her legal expenses were paid by the NEA and the California Teachers Association and the courts finally fully vindicated her. Fortunately, most teachers go through their entire professional careers without serious trouble of this kind. But when such trouble does arise and it has been determined that the teacher is not at fault, a militant professional organization should take action.

It is a great service for teachers to be militant about freedom in teaching. I was proud in the spring of 1966 when the teachers of Arkansas took to the courts that state's ancient statutes about the teaching of evolution–and won a great victory.

I hope teachers will become increasingly militant about the cooperation and support they need from the parents of their students. Fortunately most parents do their level best in this respect. There remains, however, a troublesome minority of parents who shockingly neglect their children, send them to school unwashed and unfed, and who think that obedience to the school attendance laws represents the outer limits of their responsibility for the education of their offspring. They make a fine target for militancy on the part of teachers.

Teachers whose militancy is oriented solely towards their own economic self-interests will not, of course, be successful in attacking some of these other targets. I feel that teachers, once the question of their own unity and independence is settled, will be able to decide anew what is really most important to them and to direct their new strength and purpose to its achievement.

18 Better Instruction

Research and the classroom - Unanswered questions - Regional conferences on instruction - The Centennial emphasis on quality - Beginning sooner - Lasting longer - The "special projects" - The Essay on Quality - The NEA Center for Instruction - The dropouts and dragins - Other projects - Power and purpose

When I became Executive Secretary of the National Education Association, a varied and well-established program for improving instruction was already in operation. The *NEA Journal*, for example, was publishing about a hundred pages every year on the improvement of teaching, including in many of its monthly issues a detachable centerspread for direct use in the classroom. The NEA Departments and other units were publishing twenty-three specialized magazines with a combined distribution of 1.4 million copies. Ten yearbooks, mainly devoted to the improvement of education, had a combined annual distribution of about 1.5 million. In terms of the number of impression pages issued, the National Education Association was the largest publisher of educational material in the world.

The Association was also engaged at that time in other publications, in films, and in conferences on civic education, guidance, audio-visual instruction, school health, safety education, music and art education, and the special educational problems of migrant workers' children.

In cooperation with the American Library Association, the NEA selected annually a list of outstanding books for children—a list which over the years had become a standard guide for the purchase of children's books by libraries and individuals. These lists helped to produce the relatively high level of children's literature in this country.

Research and the classroom

It seemed to me, however, that a serious gap existed between educational research and its practical application in the classroom. We therefore began to try to bridge that gap by publishing a series of small non-technical pamphlets on "What Research Says to the Classroom Teacher." The first three of these pamphlets dealt with Reading, Arithmetic and Spelling. The series has since been expanded to include more than twenty areas of instruction. The total circulation of the series had, by 1967, reached over a million copies.

This effort, however, was not as successful as I had hoped. In my opinion, as I look back on the experience, there were several reasons for its limited success.

First, it is difficult to distill some practical guidance from the immense amount of accumulated but uncoordinated research.

Second, some educational problems are not susceptible to completely objective study—and perhaps never will be. These research-resistant problems are also among the most important problems, including *inter alia* the definition of educational objectives. The complexity of the problems with which education (and therefore educational research) must deal is often not fully understood.

Another source of difficulty has been the meager financial resources available for research in education. About 1950 I made some inquiries which led me to conclude that the United States was then spending each year about $180 million on medical research, about $2,500 million on industrial research, and less than $10 million on educational research. Thus the ratio of expenditures for medical, for industrial, and for educational research was about 18:250:1. I believe the financial resources available to educational research have been somewhat improved since then, in both absolute and relative terms, due largely to expansion in federal appropriations in this field.

It seems to me also that research workers (at least educational research workers) are at their best as solo performers. Yet the score, so to speak, is written for a full orchestra. Research in education has done little to imitate or apply the concepts of team research which have met with such great success in the Manhattan Project, or in the Apollo moon landing.

But perhaps our major shortcoming has been the nearly complete absence of communication between the classroom and the educational research establishment. Much research is directed to problems which are not recognized as problems by the teachers. Closer association between the teacher and research has been regularly, almost routinely, recommended. But somehow the contact has rarely been effectively made. Educational research has value to the extent that its findings, *sooner or later*, make a difference in educational practices and policies.

But so often it doesn't make any difference. Too many educational inquiries, even quite extensive ones, end with the lame conclusion that "more research is needed." That is often just another way of saying that the study was badly planned at the outset. Other studies avoid the risk of making a firm recommendation by the cliché that "local adaptations must be made." I know that communities differ but I never have seen any good reason why children in Portland, Maine and the children of Portland, Oregon should in any important respect require different schooling.

Unanswered questions

The apparent incapacity of educational research to supply clear answers to specific questions was brought home to me during a series of television programs which the NEA produced about 1960. Parents and other citizens were asking, then as now, a number of direct, honest, and important questions about various aspects of the conduct of the public schools. Why not, I suggested, collect these questions, classify and arrange them, and ask the most distinguished and well-informed educational research experts to answer them, on camera. We tried without notable success to evoke a head-on response to these reasonable inquiries. I could understand that simple questions might require complex answers, but when I began to see that typically the answers were not only lengthy and complicated, but also evasive, I nearly cancelled the whole series. I even tried, tongue-in-cheek, to get each expert to tell us anything that he or she really knew for sure, and offered to phrase a question that would provide opportunity to give that information as the answer. Even that didn't work well.

Research in education—the systematic search for reliable evidence as the basis for educational programs and methods—has outgrown the almost random gropings of its infancy in the 'Twenties and 'Thirties. It has survived the boastful awkwardness of its adolescence in the 'Forties and 'Fifties. It should now be attaining its mature, productive, and useful years. But the problem of bringing its findings into the classroom remains, as far as I can see, essentially unsolved. We had a severe setback in this respect when, about 1965, the American Educational Research Association severed all its ties to the NEA and set up an entirely independent organization, untainted by the sordid details of classroom teaching. The researchers have, for the most part, made themselves unfamiliar with the classroom and its grubby problems and, at the same time, are astounded by the unwillingness of the bewildered teachers to heed their advice.

I did all I could to keep the educational research workers in close touch with the teachers. The AERA became a department of the NEA in 1930, and the NEA Research Division provided financial assistance and staff support to the new affiliate. I myself saw the quarterly *Review of Educational Research* through the press for many years—an immense burden. We had some modest successes—enough so that the AERA has kindly made me an honorary life member. I appreciate this gesture but I continue to feel that the unfortunate gap between theory and practice in education must somehow and sometime be bridged as a condition prerequisite to further progress. I regret that my own efforts in this respect were not more successful.

Regional conferences on instruction

Many of the Association's wide-ranging departmental activities were almost isolated from one another. Teachers of elementary and secondary schools, teachers of music, mathematics, and so forth had little contact from level to level or from discipline to discipline. Thus it seemed to me desirable to develop some techniques for at least a loose coordination of these varied efforts. Accordingly, we began to hold, about 1950, the annual conferences of the officers of the NEA's largely autonomous departments. In addition, we organized a series of regional conferences on instruction. To these conferences all NEA units with activities affecting instruction made their respective contributions.

The first of the regional instructional conferences was held in Toledo, Ohio about a year before I became Executive Secretary. The conference was organized to serve the northcentral states and was managed by Dr. Lyle W. Ashby of the NEA staff. I happened to take an active part in the Toledo meeting and I was persuaded by what I saw to try to continue these plans. The benefits accrued to the individual teachers who attended, to the school systems in the region from which they came, to the NEA departments singly and collectively, and in turn to the NEA itself.

However, the change of administration in the NEA staff, as well as budgetary problems, delayed the convening of the second regional instructional conference in Minneapolis until April 1954. This conference served Minnesota and its four adjacent states, plus Nebraska, Illinois, and the northern peninsula of Michigan. Reports by the delegates showed that the direct and indirect results in thousands of classrooms were constructive and lasting. From the very beginning of these conferences we made every effort to exclude the discussion of subjects other than instruction. We did not wish the attention of these conferences to be in any way distracted from their primary purpose—better teaching. It was difficult to maintain this concentration in view of current NEA interests in school legislation, public relations, membership recruitment, teacher welfare, and other tempting by-paths. I think, nevertheless, that we succeeded in our efforts to concentrate attention on instruction.

The Third Regional Conference on Instruction was held in Denver in April 1955 to serve the eight Rocky Mountain states. A total of 670 delegates, nearly all of whom were classroom teachers, discussed topics which cut across subject matter and school-level lines. The regional conference idea was subsequently adapted and applied in city and county school districts in this part of the United States.

The Fourth Regional Instructional Conference was held for the New England area in Boston in 1956.

In 1957 the many special NEA Centennial activities put so much extra work on the staff that no regional conference on instruction could be held. In 1958, however, the Fifth and Sixth Regional Conferences on Instruction were held for the Northwest area. They were arranged, unlike the previous conferences, in two tandem sections—the Fifth Conference for three days in Boise, Idaho and the Sixth Conference for the next four days in Portland, Oregon. The Seventh Regional Conference, which attracted over 600 delegates, was held in Oklahoma City in 1959 upon the theme, "Quality Teaching of ALL Children." In 1960, the Eighth and Ninth Regional Conferences on Instruction were held in Louisville and Minneapolis, and the Tenth and Eleventh Regional Conferences were being planned for the coming year in Hartford and Tucson.

The Centennial emphasis on quality

An important turning point in the NEA activity to improve education was reached in 1957 when the Association celebrated its Centennial. I was asked to make the closing address before the Centennial Convention in Philadelphia with the title, "The Past is Prologue." After considerable reflection I decided to propose that the emphasis of the teaching profession in the future should be on the quality of education. I thus anticipated by some three months the multi-voiced chorus which followed the Soviet launching of Sputnik I in October 1957. I said in July that America had hitherto been primarily concerned with quantity–with how many children we could get *into school*. Now, I suggested, we would in the decades ahead turn a greater share of our attention to quality–to *what each child could get out of school*. Most of the editorial comments on the Centennial Convention referred to my declaration on quality and quantity as the most important theme of the meeting.

There was, nevertheless, one aspect of quantity in education to which I felt obliged to return repeatedly. Perhaps the word "scope" is better than "quantity," and offers a more precise image of what I had in mind. In my 1966 Annual Report to the Delegate Assembly, as well as in my final report in 1967, I expressed some suggestions regarding the duration of education at public expense that should be made universally available.

Many people would probably agree that a distinctive cultural contribution of United States history has been the idea of universally available public education in secondary schools. Modern industrial societies, whatever may be their respective political and economic organization, have accepted the idea of universal elementary schooling as an indispensible public responsibility. In the United States, however, universal education was pushed upward into the secondary school many years before economic necessity or the demands of national prestige were compelling. Other countries have since followed the United States leadership in this respect, on the ground that education profoundly influences economic productivity.

Are twelve years of schooling, I asked in 1966, enough to satisfy our American ideals or our needs for human development? I responded to my own question by concluding that there is no special merit in the number twelve. On the contrary, I suggested, the nation would better exalt its ideals and achieve its potentials if it offered universal educational opportunity from the age of four and continued it for at least two years beyond the high school.

Beginning sooner

Of course, one must admit that the first four years of life are extremely important educationally. For practical and sociological reasons, however, the best response to that need is not to put these infants into institutions but rather, in most cases, to provide parents and prospective parents with information that would help them to give their children at home a healthy, productive start in life.

Beginning about age four, however, I believe that schools should offer a direct service in the education of children. I do not suggest compulsory schooling at age four, but rather its universal availability. The suggestion was not intended to replace the home but rather to supplement it, beginning at age four instead of at six.

Schooling before the first grade was steadily becoming more widely available and accepted. In the decade since I first offered these suggestions, new attitudes regarding the role of women in American society have accelerated this trend. There is a growing recognition of the desirability of providing special, early help to children whose home life does not prepare them well for a modern society. There is considerable generalized experience and some specific evidence to suggest that when such children get help and get it early, the schools later on have less difficulty in helping them to become independent, well-adjusted adults capable of leading lives of dignity for themselves and usefulness to society.

Children were attending nursery schools and kindergarten long before anyone thought of Operation Head Start and other aspects of the "War on Poverty." However, most nursery schools and many kindergartens were privately controlled and financed and, therefore, far beyond the reach of most parents whose children most needed them.

But the disadvantaged children are not exclusively those who are deprived by the poverty of the families into which they are born. The over-indulged child is also disadvantaged. So are the children whose parents are obsessed with an insatiable craving for their children to impress and excel and dominate. So are those, whatever their economic background, who are unloved. So are those who have little opportunity to play with other children or with children of other backgrounds. So are those with physical handicaps. Earlier educational opportunity could help many of these children also.

The parents should decide whether or not to send their four- and five-year-olds to school. But if the opportunity is available, at public expense and in convenient locations, I believe that most parents would elect to give their children the opportunity.

If provided, this investment would yield many valuable returns, direct and indirect. It could reduce the need for many types of remedial education. It might not make teaching any easier, but it would make teaching more exciting. Providing the younger children with a better basis for intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development would tend to change and improve the school programs for six-year-olds and subsequent years.

Lasting longer

At the other end of the "ladder," the United States public school system should rapidly offer universal opportunity for at least two years of education beyond the high school. That would be, roughly, for eighteen- and nineteen-year-olds. The effort to make two years of junior college or community college universally available after the completion of high school is already well under way.

During their early teens few individuals succeed, in this complex world, in defining their objectives in life. Fewer still reach a take-off point toward the achievement of those objectives. Moreover, maturity alone will not cause them to reach the take-off point. They need systematic help in education.

The United States would be repaid many times over by putting at least two years of further education within the reach of everyone who completes high school. By "within the reach" I mean availability without economic or geographic obstacle. By "completes high school" I mean not only those who have just graduated but also persons of whatever age who wish to learn something useful that they do not yet know.

In suggesting that the public make it possible for everyone to attend school from approximately age four to age twenty, I stressed that these four added years of opportunity should not be viewed as the prelude and the postlude to the "real" schooling but that they be considered as integral parts of a total program that might extend for sixteen years or longer. I also expressed the hope that these added years might enable the youth to achieve a higher degree of competence in and mastery over, the skills which are regarded as basic among the objectives of education.

I am bound to report that the foregoing proposals did not receive notable acclaim from my constituents. The delegates in 1966 wanted mainly to talk about (a) negotiating successfully with their employers, the school boards, and (b) integrating the teachers' organizations in the south.

A resolution on expansion of educational opportunity was adopted by the 1966 Delegate Assembly only after extended debate, several contested amendments, and a referral back to the Resolutions Committee for redrafting. When all the work on it was completed, the resolution spoke only in terms of "compensatory education" for children between four and six who "through economic or social deprivation may be seriously impeded in their progress." This, of course, was admirable but it missed my main point.

In 1967, in my final report to the Delegate Assembly, I returned to my 1966 statement but much more briefly, saying only that the American school system was moving to a sixteen-year program and that "I covet for the National Education Association a role of leadership in this extremely significant development." Either my brevity or the passage of time made a difference in the attitude of the delegates, for the resolution was adopted on this subject by the 1967 Assembly without debate. It deleted the 1966 references to "compensatory education" which, in my view, had greatly weakened the force of my original proposals.

The "special projects"

By a very substantial majority, which I believe I was entitled to regard as a vote of confidence, the Centennial Delegate Assembly

407

voted that the dues of members in the National Education Association be increased from $5 to $10 a year. This doubling of individual memberships added substantial new revenue, even though there was a slight one-year drop in total membership. I recommended, and the NEA officers approved, the allotment of a major part of the added revenue to the Association's program for the improvement of instruction. The budget for existing activities in this area of service was increased by about forty percent.

In addition, a major part of the added revenue was earmarked for what we called "special projects". These special projects dealt in the main, though not exclusively, with the quality of education and covered such matters as Automation, Visual Aids, English Composition, Juvenile Delinquency, the Education of School Dropouts, and the Education of the Academically Talented.

Under the procedure which I devised for them, all special projects were supposed to operate for no more than a single year. The staff members in charge were expected to show that, given these additional funds, they could produce visible and valuable results in a twelve-month period.

I feel rather proud of the "special projects" concept. Without this device, the added NEA revenue could easily have been distributed among long-standing "regular" activities with no memorable results, like a cup of water poured on desert sand.

The Essay on Quality

Two major new activities were undertaken in search of quality education during the very first full year of the NEA Expanded Program–1958-59. The Educational Policies Commission completed and published *An Essay on Quality in Education.* This small but powerful volume began with the proposition that the American two-fold educational tradition (we did not shrink from correctly using the word "tradition" in those days) was universality and diversification. The school program, elementary and secondary, teaching and guidance, was briefly examined in the light of these two traditions. A short section on the characteristics of a good teacher was then followed by an equally terse review of the requirements of the school administration. The concluding pages offered a few definite measures of judging excellence:

> A school system should have at least fifty professionals per thousand pupils.

> School districts should be so organized that a four-year high school will enroll not less than 500 students (or 350 students in a three-year high school).
>
> An elementary school should enroll at least 250 students.
>
> The starting salaries for qualified beginning teachers should at least equal the starting salaries for new college graduates in other occupations in the same community.
>
> The salary for experienced, qualified, successful teachers should be double that of beginning teachers in ten years.

The back-up explanation for the foregoing conclusions was clearly presented. It provided a measurement of the financial requirements of excellence in a school system—the best such measure, in my view, that has been developed. I do not understand why it was so little used, especially by school administrators and others concerned about the resources needed for quality.

The NEA Center for Instruction

The second major aspect of the initial effort to help improve quality involved the establishment and staffing of the NEA Council on Instruction, consisting of representatives of about twenty-five NEA departments and other NEA units having a substantial interest in better teaching. This activity was continued in 1959 as one of the special projects.

Many of the special projects were continued and expanded through funds granted to the NEA by various philanthropic foundations. All of them received cordial and active cooperation from public school systems, colleges, and universities—cooperation which could not have been purchased at any price, cooperation which had the doubled advantage of providing the projects with needed resources and of ensuring a wider discussion of their findings.

In the case of the special project on instruction, however, I felt that the performance of the committee and of the staff was of such value to the Association and to the profession that I recommended a permanent place for it in the NEA structure.

A fourteen-member National Committee was set up to advise the project staff. The Committee included teachers, administrators, and university professors. Distinguished scholars and other citizens were asked for advice on special topics. The first major report, entitled, "Schools for the 'Sixties," identified and described twelve major areas of decision, twelve corresponding questions about instruction, and thirty-three rather specific recommendations.

Renamed in 1964 the Center for the Study of Instruction, this activity became a focal point for assistance to the profession in improving the quality of service which schools render to society.

The dropouts and dragins

A related special project dealt with the students who leave school for no good reason—the early dropouts. There was in the 1960's a crescendo of public interest and concern for these young people. One of the project's most important conclusions was that the most common identifying feature of a potential dropout is a child with a reading problem. Such a child, said the NEA President in the 1962 Presidential Address, may leave school mentally some years before he or she is legally permitted to drop out physically. The emphasis given to this conclusion and to related matters led to considerable public activity aimed at providing special programs for those many students who cannot be (and need not be) pushed or dragged through a standard college preparatory curriculum.

In June 1963, during a White House Conference with educators, there was general recognition that the early school dropout was one of the nation's most critical educational problems—a problem which subsequently gave rise to many other social conflicts and personal tragedies. The NEA Dropout Project estimated that about 300,000 youth were likely to decide in the summer of 1963 to leave school for good. Unskilled in a world that has no room at the bottom, these youths would gravely impair their ability to claim their rights to liberty and the pursuit of happiness. In my report to the 1963 Delegate Assembly, I gave strong emphasis to this impending tragedy. I called on each delegate to make a personal special effort during the coming summer to retrieve as many as possible of these youngsters who were at that moment teetering c the edge of a serious, perhaps lifelong, mistake. I called on ea delegate to get in touch with at least one potential dropout an if need be, with her or his family, to show that the teachers and the great impersonal school systems they comprise care deeply what happens to each student and to persuade them that they owe it to themselves and to their country to re-enter school in the autumn. I adapted a slogan from Dr. Laubach's famous literacy campaign: "Let each one reach one."

With the active help of the special dropout project, I followed up this proposal by letters and other reminders. By mid-October the dropout project informed me that between 75,000 and 100,000 youngsters had returned to school under the influence of the NEA program.

The NEA Dropout Project published three major reports, culminating in a massive study—the first of its kind and scope—of the holding power of the large urban school systems.

Other projects

Many of the Association's activities related to improved instruction focussed on specific school systems. This was a trend which I welcomed, for I thought it was ineffective and possibly harmful for teaching to be appraised and modified by efforts unaffected by direct contact with real schools and live children and teachers.

Thus, for example, the Project in English Composition was conducted mainly in nine school districts: Ardmore, Pennsylvania; Baltimore; Cleveland Heights; Greensboro, North Carolina; Lake Charles, Louisiana; Lansing; Richmond; Seattle; and Wichita. The goal in this case was a sequential English composition curriculum for grades four through twelve, with experiments on the use of lay readers in correcting and grading student's themes; emphasis on grammar, spelling, structure, and style; and special attention for culturally-deprived youth at the junior high school level.

Again, in audio-visual education, the pay and working conditions of television studio teachers was examined in Courtland, Ohio and Miami, Florida.

Still another example of decentralization was provided by the Project on Automation in Education which operated pilot projects in Quincy, Massachusetts and Parkersburg, West Virginia to determine the adjustments needed in education to meet the impact of automation.

Further illustrations of attention by the Association to the quality of instruction could be added, but I think enough has been supplied to make clear that in my view a professional organization should devote a substantial part of its time, energy, and resources to assisting its members to do a more effective job. I felt that this effort could not be made by lip-service and that it could not be merely a by-product of other activities. I would like to think that the ability of the Association to work simultaneously to elevate both the economic status and the professional competence of teachers and school administrators was one of its major achievements during the years when I was its chief executive officer.

Of course, many Association activities cannot readily be classified as being directly productive in terms of better instruction. For example, to secure increases in the G.I. benefits for education or in the National Defense Education Act programs might be considered as legislative activities although they obviously also affect the scope and quality of instruction.

Power and purpose

In the closing years of my service to the Association, I became aware of a tendency among some of the elected leadership and even some of the employed staff to give primary attention to power and the sources of power within the NEA itself. This concern for power inevitably reduced the amount of attention to the purposes and achievements of the Association. Every voluntary organization, of course, must devote some time to the assignment of responsibilities. Beginning after the Delegate Assembly of 1955, however, many of the officers of the Association, individually and in their various meetings, appeared to me to be excessively preoccupied with questions of power.

Every meeting gave rise to almost interminable discussions about which agency of the Association should have jurisdiction in certain matters, whether the Executive Secretary had too much influence, whether the state affiliates should have more authority than the local affiliates, whether the Directors of the NEA should be consulted on all NEA activities within their respective states, and so forth. Such questions of power are important but they are not all-important. When they become dominant for a long period of time, they tend to suppress attention to the central business of the Association.

Something about the ontogeny of a complex organization, I believe, impels the organization to weary of reaching for purpose and to substitute the easier, and usually more exciting, reach for power. This built-in transformation will continue indefinitely unless some concerned person or group continuously strives to subordinate power to purpose. This was my objective and, in part, my responsibility.

I am sure that the basic concern of the individual member of the National Education Association was—and I suspect still is—that the objectives of the Association are sound and that reasonable progress is being made toward their achievement. The individual members should be encouraged to ask questions and to receive complete answers about the purpose and productivity of the Association. A member has, I think, a right to expect that the elected officers will show a similar concern. Provided that the Association is working effectively on the proper objectives, neither the members nor the elected officers nor the employed staff need be profoundly concerned about the distribution of authority.

For a number of years I was able to arrange that at every meeting of the Board of Directors one of the assistant executive secretaries would give a detailed report to the Board on progress toward the achievement of the objectives of the Association in his or her area of responsibility. Thus, the Board could at regular intervals evaluate the actual program of the Association. The rising concern about power, however, gradually eclipsed the concern about program and purpose. The Board of Directors almost always lacked time and energy to consider, and even the staff sometimes lacked time to prepare, materials related to purpose and achievement.

At a meeting of the Board of Directors in Washington in October 1966 this process had reached almost the zenith of futility. On that occasion, as always, the Board of Directors had to vote on the place of its next meeting. After due consideration, the place was fixed and a decisive vote was taken. A few hours later there was a motion to reconsider. Debate on the motion to reconsider followed. At last the motion to reconsider was put and passed. Debate was then renewed at length on the place of the meeting and a different decision was reached the second time around.

It will surprise no one to be told that the real issue was essentially a question of power. It made very little difference to the program, purpose, or achievements of the Association whether the Board met in one place or another. At that particular meeting, the Board used almost one-third of its time in deciding where to hold its next meeting. Meanwhile, documents describing the purposes and activities of several units of the Association, documents which the Board had specifically requested at a previous meeting, went virtually unnoticed while members of the staff who had given up their weekends to present these documents waited on the sidelines.

In July 1967, I made an emphatic statement to the Board of Directors on the consequences of such procedures. I thought that the time had come to put purposes and results at the peak of official concern, that people who are deeply concerned about substance will become less concerned about status. Whether this declaration was understood and, if so, whether it had any lasting effect, I cannot say.

19 NEA: General Administration

Staff relations - The "Outside" Survey - Deputy Executive Secretary - Other staff problems - The NEA Building - Miracle on Sixteenth Street - Dedication - The NEA Centennial - Centennial goals - Centennial programs - Congressional relations - The Fulbright Act - UNESCO Charter - International exchanges - The Economic Report - Office of Education budget - Postal rates - Rural library and education beyond-the-high-school grants - Telstar - Support for overseas schools - International Education Act - Bilingual education - Procedures at committee hearings.

This chapter covers aspects of general NEA administration and some observations about the nature of the job of the NEA Executive Secretary during the fifteen years I held that office.

The chapter includes some of the successes and failures involved in staff relations, the construction and financing of a new NEA Headquarters, the NEA Centennial Program of 1957 and its antecedents, and Congressional relations.

Staff relations

When I became NEA Executive Secretary in 1952, the Association had 500 employees in the Washington headquarters. They were organized in 67 divisions, commissions, committees, departments, and a council. Although I had worked in various capacities at the NEA headquarters for nearly a quarter-century, I was by no means familiar with the nature of the work of all the people whose activities I was now called on to assist and coordinate.

During my first few weeks in the new office I embarked on an organized program of self-education with regard to the work of the 67 staff units.

A number of general suggestions emerged from these conferences. There was a general uneasiness about the absence of staff personnel services, particularly recruitment. This function had been handled as a sideline by the manager of the office of the Executive Secretary. I employed as soon as possible an experienced personnel director.

With the help of the new Personnel Director, a new staff salary schedule was developed, with the first detailed job descriptions, and salaries which were competitive, for similar ability and qualifications, with salaries paid by other employers in the District of Columbia. We also took steps as rapidly as feasible and in cooperation with the Staff Organization to reorganize and modernize the staff regulations which dealt with retirement, social security, job security, group hospitalization, annual leave, sick leave, hours of employment, and group insurance.

One other conclusion emerged (in my mind at least) from the "indoctrinations" of the Executive Secretary. I did not say much about this conclusion to other people, partly because I feared misunderstanding and partly because I had no immediate idea how to deal with the matter. This unspoken conclusion was that I felt incapable of supplying leadership to the staff as it was then organized—or more accurately, as the staff was then dispersed. Sixty-seven units reporting directly to the Executive Secretary meant that, under the tyranny of the clock and of the calendar, most of the staff units would report to no one.

Under Executive Secretary Crabtree, my predecessor-once-removed, the heads of all NEA units in a staff of fifty or so persons could assemble with him around a table in about a dozen chairs. My immediate predecessor, Executive Secretary Willard Givens, had a staff in the hundreds, an unusual capacity for detail, and a prodigious memory. I have never known anyone else who could absorb more information and recall it longer. He could, by ways I do not comprehend, keep track in his own way of 67 different staff units. I envied this capacity but I knew that my abilities were inadequate to carry his policy forward. I thought that the only workable solution was a staff reorganization. At that time I was ignorant about staff relationships and had never heard the term "span of control." However, I was not ignorant (or insensitive) enough to carelessly toss about the words "staff reorganization." I knew enough to know that I needed honest, experienced, competent, and inconspicuous help. I therefore called five of my most trusted friends to Washington for a three-day session on how to reorganize the NEA staff.

With their collective wisdom and such insight as I could myself produce, I set to work. First, I arranged matters so that I received instructions from the NEA Board of Directors to prepare a plan for the reorganization of the NEA staff "designed to promote the greatest possible coordination of effort and effectiveness of services to members of the Association." Before presenting the requested plan of reorganization to the Board, I discussed it individually with the heads of each of the existing staff units. With one or two half-hearted exceptions, the units concerned readily agreed to the reorganization. The plan was adopted by the Board in February 1955 with the understanding that the details might need to be changed from time to time as new circumstances arose and as experience was gained. The reorganization, in summary, called for six assistant executive secretaries with the indicated responsibilities which follow:

I. Field Operations–Affiliates, local convention committees, field service schedules, New England special representative, state field workers, membership promotion, the Building Fund until completed.

II. Educational Services–Citizenship education, tax education, safety education, international relations, joint committees with American Medical Association and American Library Association, adult education, audio-visual and rural services, instructional conferences, convention program, NEA Centennial until completed.

III. Lay Relations–Joint committees with Magazine Publishers, American Legion, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, other lay contacts and organizations not elsewhere assigned, NEA elections and bylaws committees.

IV. Business Manager–Business, banking, building management, purchasing, sales, accounts, records, travel services.

V. Professional Development and Welfare–Future teachers, teacher education, accreditation, professional standards, teacher's fellowships, Defense Commission, credit unions, professional ethics, tenure, teacher retirement.

VI. Information Services–Research, publications, NEA Journal, press and radio and TV, American Education Week, NEA motion pictures.

Not assigned to any Assistant Secretary and attached to the Office of the Executive Secretary–Educational Policies Commission, NEA resolutions committee, Legislative Commission, personnel director, office manager, WCOTP relations.

Thus, the number of persons reporting to me was reduced from more than sixty to twelve. It soon became apparent that the Legislative Commission was so important that the staff head of that effort should become the seventh assistant secretary.

The Assistant Executive Secretaries and I met for one hour every Monday at 11 a.m. Sometimes we stayed in session and had lunch brought in to us, but usually we could finish the "must" items by noon.

The entire reorganization appeared to me to work very well. I made at least one mistake, however. (I mean, of course, one mistake in this reorganization; I must have made many other mistakes elsewhere.) The mistake was to designate the Monday morning meetings as "the Cabinet." It gave people outside "the Cabinet" an agency to which their occasional frustrations could be directed. It raised inaccurate ideas of status and prestige. The parallel to the Cabinet in the United States Government and in state governments was far from exact or helpful. We heard from time to time that such-and-such an activity, or person, or special project, should be given "Cabinet status."

One could not continually and normally speak of "the Monday morning meeting of the Executive Secretary and the Assistant Executive Secretaries;" a simpler term was essential. We might have done better by saying, "the Monday group." We could hardly have done worse than "Cabinet."

The "Outside" Survey

Before the increase in NEA dues was considered by the Delegate Assembly in 1957, I wanted the officers and members of the Association to feel assured that everything possible had been done to organize the NEA staff to handle the added funds and responsibilities.

Accordingly, I brought to the NEA Executive Committee in June 1956 a proposal for a survey of NEA management by Cresap, McCormick, and Padgett, a firm which specialized in studies of this kind. Their fee, I estimated, would be about $40,000. Most members of the Executive Committee immediately stated their support of the proposal. A "look from the outside," they said, was logical, particularly in view of the NEA's recent rapid growth and of the need to give members confidence in the efficiency of the organization. In October 1956, the necessary budgetary arrangements having been made, the Executive Committee formally approved the project. The work started at once. The line-by-line study on the survey recommendations took place at the March 1958 meeting of the Executive Committee.

The Committee did not accept and implement each and every one of the Management Survey's 534 recommendations. The advantage of an "outside" survey was to secure disinterested advice from experienced management consultants. Such freedom from traditional ties has another aspect–the long history that had created NEA procedures and the subtle human relationships that maintained these procedures. The introduction of "standard" practices might be offset by losses in morale and efficiency.

The Executive Committee decided to try to combine the best of both worlds–a detailed knowledge of Association traditions and the impartial judgments of the expert outside survey.

Some of the recommendations required changes in the NEA Bylaws. Other recommendations, although requiring no change in bylaws, called for major changes in staff personnel assignments and relationships. Still other suggested changes affected day-to-day operation but involved no basic questions of policy.

Bylaw changes suggested by the survey included: a smaller Representative Assembly, a direct mail ballot by all members for the election of the President, a Nominations Committee to ensure that every important office was contested by at least two candidates, and NEA standards for state and local affiliates. The survey proposals also dealt with terms of directors, department membership, budget, and the membership year–all of which involved bylaws changes.

The Executive Committee directed that this group of changes, together with the full text of the survey's case for its proposals, be referred to the Standing Committee on the NEA Bylaws. The Bylaws Committee was free to take any action it thought wise on these recommendations, but the Executive Committee offered some of its own observations on most of the proposed changes.

On only one of the survey recommendations on bylaws did the Executive Committee take an unequivocal stand. It flatly opposed the survey recommendation for a mail ballot available to all members in the election of the President. The Committee did not believe this procedure would improve the quality of officers. Considering the value of a million or more voters who knew nothing about the candidates except their names, photographs, and occupation, the Executive Committee preferred the votes of four or five thousand delegates who had also seen and heard the rival candidates several times during a five-day meeting. The Executive Committee believed the smaller group would make a better choice on the whole, than the larger one.

Deputy Executive Secretary

Among the recommendations calling for major changes in staff personnel and relations, the key proposal was to establish the post of deputy executive secretary. This new official would normally serve as a staff officer but would assume full responsibility for the functions of the Executive Secretary whenever the latter might be disabled or absent from the Washington headquarters. The Executive Committee approved this survey recommendation at once.

I set out then at last to find the best possible deputy. I found him in the NEA staff. Dr. Lyle W. Ashby had served the NEA in a variety of responsible positions. He was, at that time, the Assistant Executive Secretary for Educational Services to whom three division directors, three committee secretaries, and the consultant on elementary education were reporting. He was also the staff liaison for eighteen NEA departments with a strong interest in educational services. I recommended his appointment as Deputy to the Executive Committee in October 1958 and it was quickly approved. I have tried to omit from these pages expressions of gratitude to my colleagues in the NEA staff. There are too many of them for such a record. But I must break my self-imposed rule in this one case. Dr. Ashby took full administrative charge on numerous occasions during my absence, sometimes extended absence, from Washington. He shielded me from numerous difficulties and compiled a record of wise and responsible decisions. The relation between an administrator and his deputy is bound to be closely personal. I can say that never in our nine years together did I experience one instant of regret or even of uncertainty.

Other staff problems

In an organization such as the NEA there is an issue which few people mention but on which many people think. I mean the employment of a President or a recent Past-President in the permanent staff. I was firmly opposed to such appointments. Although urged, both directly and implicitly, to make several such appointments, I did not yield. One President embarrassed me (and perhaps himself) by requesting an appointment to fill a top position that was about to become vacant by the retirement of the incumbent. I was obliged to decline, making it as palatable as I could by saying that this was a general policy and was not a reflection on the applicant's ability. When the President has been a few years out of office I see no harm in proposing such an appointment. I did, in fact, propose such appointments to two Past Presidents who had been out of office for five to ten years. One of these accepted my invitation; the other declined.

The NEA Staff Organization was established in the final year of the administration of my predecessor. I found it on many occasions a useful ally and the source of many friendships. I consulted often with the officers of the Staff Organization with regard to salaries and other conditions of service. We had, however, during the last few months of my NEA service a clear difference of opinion. The officers of the Staff Organization demanded the right to meet with the Executive Committee for the purpose of discussing their salaries and conditions of service. I was ready to agree that circumstances might arise in the future when the interest of the Association might be served by such a conference. I would not concede that such consultation is an unquestionable right of the Staff Organization.

The NEA Building

During my entire administration as Executive Secretary, the housing of the staff of the Association was a continuing preoccupation. At the Miami Beach Convention in 1953 the Association began the immense task of constructing a building to house its staff and the meetings of its elected officers.

When I became Executive Secretary, the Association's activities were housed in a converted old-style four-story mansion, a small fairly modern office building, a small remodeled dwelling, a converted garage, three floors of a hotel, and a converted warehouse. Desk space was less than half the minimum United States Government standard. Crowding, poor light, inaccessible files, noise, and poor ventilation were commonplace. Messengers and a rented truck shuttled projects from building to building. In 1952 the Delegate Assembly, reviewing these conditions, instructed the Trustees to act with "boldness and vision" to remedy this situation. One of my first tasks as Executive Secretary was to launch a campaign for a Five Million Dollar Building Fund.

The decision to keep the offices of the Association at the northeast corner of 16th and M Streets had already been made. A new site would have eliminated the complexities of remodelling and the staff could have remained at its current locations until moving day. The transfer to the new location could then have occurred with a minimum of delay and confusion. On the other hand, no location in Washington was as good as, or better than, the site already occupied. This site had been bought when land prices were very much lower than they were in 1952. Besides, it was near the government offices and other professional organizations with which the staff needed to be in frequent contact.

It was clear that "boldness and vision" could not be financed out of existing operating revenue. Part of the Building Fund came from gifts by individual members. Most of it came from new Life Members. The revenue from Life Membership fees was, in accordance with the bylaws, placed in a separate reserve fund which could be used only for acquiring land and for construction and remodelling costs.

By July 1953 the Building Fund had about $80,000 in cash and pledges. Still to go: $4,920,000.

By July 1954, the Building Fund held in cash and pledges $1,250,000. Still to go: $3,750,000.

By July 1955, cash and pledges in the Building Fund were $3,046,000. Still to go, only $1,954,000.

In December 1953, the Trustees let the contract for the first unit of the new building. The staff continued for six more years to work in the midst of a major construction job. Our desks were shaken by pile drivers and our conversations were punctuated by pneumatic drills.

By the summer of 1956, the cash and pledges had reached $4.5 million. As the construction work proceeded, the cash was used up and the Association made some short term loans in order to continue the cash payments for the builders. A remarkable fact about this entire activity, however, is the high degree of ultimate full payment of practically all pledges. Out of a total of over nine million dollars, the Trustees found it necessary to cancel pledges for less than $500,000 involving only 429 delinquencies for all reasons—death, retirements, severe personal financial losses, and a miniscule number of deliberate defaults.

By the summer of 1957, the Centennial year of the Association, over nine million dollars in cash and pledges had been received. By the summer of 1958, the construction of the new building as originally planned was nearly completed and a date in February 1959 was set for the formal dedication exercises. By this time, however, the District of Columbia had adopted regulations requiring certain types of buildings to provide a specified quantity of offstreet parking. The Trustees, therefore, approved plans for an addition on the east of the original plans in the form of a combined office-and-parking unit. This new unit was opened for use on June 1, 1962. The NEA President at the time kindly arranged a surprise birthday party for me on that occasion.

By 1963, the buildings were completely free of indebtedness.

In 1965, plans were approved for yet another addition on property acquired by the NEA immediately to the north of the original buildings. This unit was completed in 1967, the year I left the service of the Association.

Miracle on Sixteenth Street

Many people have wondered how "the teachers" could accomplish this economic "miracle." I have often been asked for the name of the fund-raising firm employed by the Association. We did consider that possibility but we decided that professional fund-raising would be not only unnecessary but also, in all probability, more of a handicap than a supplement to our own grass-roots, person-to-person efforts.

Another reason for the success of the Building Fund was the ease with which the necessity for it could be shown. The work of the Association was really being hampered by the lack of proper quarters. Anyone could easily perceive that with his or her own eyes and ears.

Another very important advantage arose from the fact that the policy direction of the Building Fund campaign was largely in the hands of the Board of Trustees.

The Trustees were five in number. Four of them were elected for four-year terms by the Board of Directors; the fifth member was, *ex officio,* the current NEA President who served for one year. The implicit criterion for election of the Trustees was, for many years, the reputation of the candidate for sound judgment and extensive knowledge of the Association. Normally, the Trustees gained this knowledge by years of leadership in the Executive Committee and other important NEA offices. Although it was not a requirement, all of the Trustees elected whilst I was Executive Secretary were former Presidents of the Association. Since the Trustees were often re-elected for second and even third four-year terms, this meant that former Presidents of the Association had considerably less than one chance in four of attaining a Trusteeship. Or, to state the proposition obversely, the Directors had a wide range of choice, including the Past Presidents, and could thus select the men and women in whom they had the highest trust.

One other reason for the success of the Trustees should be mentioned. The Trustees, being relatively free of the moment-to-moment pressure of Association politics, could take a long view of future needs. The operating surplus at the end of each fiscal year reverted, under the terms of the bylaws, to the control of the Trustees. They had for many years put most of these small annual accretions into the Permanent Fund from which, in turn, they could make payments to the Building Fund. A long tradition which I was fortunate to inherit, provided that anticipated income for the coming year be set at the amount of income created by the operations of the year just ending. Thus, with substantial annual increases in the number of members, and therefore in membership income, there was nearly always a surplus to be set aside for the Permanent Fund. Attempts to use these surplus funds for operating purposes were continuous and vigorous as different crises came and went. However, I was able, with the aid of the politically secure Trustees, to build a substantial sum to start the building construction process even before the special drive for the Building Fund was launched.

The Board of Trustees has, since my departure, been abolished. If I had any further responsibility for the governance of the NEA I would have certainly recommended very strongly against such a step. I hope that when the time comes, as it must come, (and may, for all I know, have come already) that the Association needs substantial reserves for capital improvements or to meet some great unforeseen crisis, steps will be taken in time to reactivate some small dedicated group like the Trustees and to entrust power to them to deal with the new situation.

As for the building itself, I made only one decision of importance. A year or so before the plans were drawn I happened to be, for a reason I now forget, on the campus of the University of Iowa with an hour or so to spend before proceeding to the airport. I was taken to see the new library of the University and was impressed by the way it had been designed and built for maximum flexibility. I kept that general idea in mind and resurrected it many months later when the Trustees were discussing with the architect the design of the new NEA headquarters. One of the things I had learned about the NEA in my years of experience was that it was a growing and constantly changing organization. We asked the architect to design a building with a minimum of fixed walls. It should be possible to install temporary walls at almost any point so that every enclosed space, of whatever size or shape, would have light, heating, cooling, window space, and connections for telephone and electric-powered office machines. That is the way it was done. I learned later that the name for such an arrangement is "modular" construction.

My wife who, given the necessary technical training, would have made an excellent architect, offered a number of helpful suggestions regarding design and decor. She did the interior of the Executive Secretary's office in a way that combined comfort, efficiency, dignity, and variety of use. She was, more than anyone else, responsible for the preservation of a large room on the top floor where a hundred people could meet without the inconvenience of pillars which would have blocked their view. She located the staff dining room in an attractive section of the main floor, looking out on a patio, for the very good reason that a room used daily by many people should be one of the most attractive rooms in the building. And she saved an Italian marble fireplace that was in the old mansion and had it placed where it would add to the attractiveness of one of the meeting rooms. That fireplace, I believe, is the only remaining physical link with the nineteenth century mansion which the NEA occupied as an office for forty years.

Dedication

The dedication of the new building was held for three days in February 1959. Speakers from outside of the organization included Luther Evans who had just completed five years of service as Director-General of UNESCO; Grayson Kirk, the new President of Columbia University; Lawrence Derthick, the United States Commissioner of Education; Arthur Fleming, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; Senator Lister Hill of Alabama; and many more. We had special messages from state governors and others which we sealed in a "time capsule" to be opened in 1999. The Association was given an upright piano by the Staff Organization, and a magnificnet grand piano by Charl Ormand Williams, NEA President in 1922. The NEA staff chorus sang beautifully. We had an afternoon of chamber music.

The NEA Centennial

In 1951, six years before the event, the National Education Association set up a "Centennial Action Program," twenty goals to be achieved or approached before the Centennial itself in 1957. The Centennial Action Program, promptly acronymized to CAP, was a useful way of keeping in mind the Association's major goals. I hoped also to be able to measure–insofar as possible–the amount of progress actually achieved.

Centennial Goals

The first three goals called for more affiliated local education associations and more effective state and national educational associations. During the six years of CAP, the number of local affiliates increased by over fifty percent. The effectiveness of the state and national associations cannot be defined in numerical terms but it is true that the state associations grew under CAP to include about ninety percent of all teachers and the NEA membership rose fifty-one percent in the six years.

Goals Four, Five and Six dealt directly with membership in the organization. They proposed nothing less ambiticus than 100 percent membership at all three levels, with a single membership fee for all three collected at the local level, and the integration of local, state, and national committees. In 1951 the number of states with unified dues had been only seven, and this number remained constant through 1957. Major breakthroughs towards the unified membership idea did not occur until the late 'Sixties and early 'Seventies.

Goal Seven called for a Future Teachers organization in every institution preparing teachers. By 1957 there were such chapters in 650 teacher training institutions with a combined student membership of about 40,000. This, of course, was far below both the potential and the goal. I must admit that this did not greatly concern me. I was convinced, by a careful review of all the hard evidence I could find or collect, that the part of the Association's resources directed to student membership was among its least productive expenditures.

Goal Eight called for a professionally competent person in each school position. There was plenty of dictionary-trouble in defining this objective but by 1957 about two-thirds of the teachers in the public elementary schools held a baccalaureate or higher degree. The comparable figure in the secondary schools was about 97 percent.

Goal Nine called for strong state departments of education and an adequate federal education agency. During the CAP the personnel working in state education agencies doubled and the United States Office of Education had, with strong NEA support, embarked on the Cooperative Educational Research Program.

Goals Ten, Eleven, and Twelve dealt with teachers' salaries, protection against arbitrary dismissal, leaves of absence, retirement, and reasonable teacher-student ratios. During CAP the average salary of teachers rose about seven percent per year. This was progress but it did not produce the full CAP goal of an "adequate professional salary." Retirement systems were substantially improved, often by a combination with the Federal Social Security benefits. The postwar lag in school construction combined with high birthrates left the pupil-teacher ratio in most communities with little or no improvement and in spots some deterioration.

Goal Thirteen called for units of local school administration large enough to provide good and comprehensive education. By 1957 consolidation of small local school systems had reduced the number of basic school administrative units to about 55,000 and the trend continued downward for several years thereafter.

Goals Fourteen and Fifteen called for "adequate" educational opportunity for all, including the state and federal funds needed for this purpose. While "adequate" was, and remains, a source of ambiguity, equivocation, and controversy, there can be little serious doubt that considerable progress was made in the CAP years in the quality of school books, teaching materials, teaching films and other audio-visual aids, and better school environment. State funds for education increased almost everywhere but CAP failed to make any significant change in the monumental public indifference regarding federal funding. Three months after the NEA Centennial meeting, Sputnik I went roaring into orbit and the walls of public indifference began to crack a little. How often do people act wisely for the wrong reasons!

Goal Sixteen bespoke for all youth a "safe, beautiful, and wholesome" community environment. It is impossible to generalize on such a vast and nebulous goal. However, on a single aspect of "safety," one can make a reasonable estimate. The accidental death rate among elementary school age children went down to about 240 per million per year. This means saving the lives of some 4,000 children per year in spite of greatly increased risks due to heavier automobile traffic and other hazards. Part of this happy result, no doubt, was due to better medical care of injured children. Some part may be due to better engineering of streets and highways. But most of the gain, in my opinion, is due to the remarkable NEA Safety Education program.

Goals Seventeen and Eighteen called for better support for public education, including public-spirited local boards of education. The CAP years saw a vast increase in informed public interest in the schools. This is not a trait that can be arithmetically calibrated, but I gave the matter almost constant attention. I have referred to a number of such events in preceding chapters.

Goals Nineteen and Twenty called for strengthening of the efforts of the World Organization of the Teaching Profession and of UNESCO. I have already discussed in some detail these and related activities.

During the CAP, two additional goals were added to the list. Goal Twenty-One called for increasing participation by college and university teachers in a united teaching profession. If this goal had been achieved by the CAP program or by any other program, I would regard it as one of the greatest events in the history of education. I could give plenty of excuses for our collective failure to unite the teaching profession in this respect. The goal remains as highly desirable–and as infuriatingly remote–as it was when the CAP was adopted in 1951.

Goal Twenty-Two, the last of CAP, was a new NEA Education Center. In 1951 there was not even a plan for such a facility. By 1957 most of the construction was finished and a major part of the new headquarters was occupied and in use.

Centennial programs

The first item in the list of the Centennial Celebration Commission's twenty-eight projects was to establish the theme of the Centennial: "An Educated People Moves Freedom Forward."

The Joint NEA-State Association Film Committee produced a Centennial film. Entitled "A Desk for Billie," the film was based on a true story of the same title carried in the *Saturday Evening Post.* It is a story of educational opportunity, a story that has happened to multiplied millions of children in America, but a story told in this instance with a powerful emotional impact. It is a story of victory over deprivation and the role of the school in winning that victory. I wish it could be shown as a perennial rerun on television.

Dr. Edgar B. Wesley, then visiting professor at Stanford University, was commissioned to write the Centennial History, *NEA: The First Hundred Years.* It was a thorough job, based on many original sources and extended interviews with the survivors of the early days of the Association. The NEA selected Dr. Wesley but laid down no specifications, imposed no restrictions, and exercised no censorship. The book of 419 pages was completed on October 1, 1956, copyrighted in 1957, and published by Harper and Brothers.

The American composer, Dr. Howard Hansen, Director of the Eastman School of Music, University of Rochester, was commissioned to write the Centennial music. The work, entitled "Song of Democracy" for choir and symphony orchestra, had its first performance in Washington on April 4, 1957 by the Washington

Symphony Orchestra, and the Howard University Choir. It was also performed by the Philadelphia Symphony during the Centennial Convention at a special concert honoring the NEA.

The Centennial Commission also tackled a task equally important, but less tangible, than most of its other projects. It tried to involve the nation in community considerations of the decisive role of education in the changing world. It supplied a leaflet containing discussion outlines and plans for a historical review of local school systems. Over 100,000 copies were distributed and used by PTA groups, school boards, teachers' groups, civic groups of many types, veterans' groups, farmers' organizations, trade unions, industrial organizations.

The Commission supplied pictures, art work, articles, and editorial suggestions to local, state, and departmental affiliates, to high school and college newspapers and annuals.

Kits on the Centennial suitable for public-service announcements were sent to radio and TV stations with the help of the National Association of Radio and TV Broadcasters.

Magazine editors, including those of general circulation as well as some 800 service, civic, religious, trade, and fraternal group magazines, received basic kits and other materials adapted to their editorial interests.

The American Library Association prepared and printed 500,000 copies of a list of selected readings under the Centennial theme: "Moving Freedom Forward."

Local affiliates of the NEA were given clip sheets and spot announcements to help them contact their local newspapers and radio-TV stations.

Special Centennial editions of the monthly *NEA Journal,* the yearly *NEA Handbook,* and the biweekly *School and Society* were prepared and published.

The Commission persuaded the United States Post Office to issue the NEA Centennial commemorative stamp which, with all due ceremony, went on sale at Philadelphia, the city where the NEA was founded by forty-three members in 1857, the same city to which the Centennial Convention drew 6,126 delegates and about an equal number of alternates and other interested persons.

The most ambitious of all the operations of the Centennial Commission was the NEA "birthday party" of April 4, 1957. I have, in a previous chapter, described the appearance of President

Eisenhower on that occasion. On that date, as the edge of night moved westward across the continent and the Pacific, from Maine to Alaska and Hawaii there occurred, in severely functional school cafeterias, in school gymnasiums, in sumptuous restaurants, and hotel ballrooms, gatherings of members of the Association and their friends to celebrate its hundredth birthday. We know of at least 2,500 such occasions, large and small. Probably about five hundred more did not come directly to the attention of the central staff.

The Centennial Commission received about 1,200 written reports on such meetings accompanied by a blizzard of newspaper clippings and photographs of these events.

One of my favorites among these local reports was the one from Ulysses, a town in southwest Kansas on the North Fork of the Cimarron River. The town's rather unusual name was not bestowed on it by some far-wandering classical scholar. The explanation is much more simple: Ulysses is the county seat of Grant County. The NEA Centennial Dinner there was sponsored by the Grant County Teachers Association. Southwest Kansas is, at some seasons, a dry and dust-blowing area. On the evening set for the dinner, the President of the County Association wrote, the wind-borne dust was so dense that one could not see the highway–"a total blackout," she called it. Number of teachers in Grant County: 75. Number present at the dinner: 75–plus the school board, plus the PTA officers, plus 35 other local citizens. They ate their Centennial Dinner in the school gymnasium. They lit their candles and cut the birthday cake beneath the basketball goal. The tables were gaily decorated. The President wore a real orchid. When the local photographer took their group picture, to give NEA-Washington a record of this great occasion, they all smiled for the camera–proud, friendly, relaxed, and unconquerable. As their President wrote: "We did what we could to help make 1957 very important." As far as I know, nothing equivalent in national significance has happened in the entire history of Ulysses, Kansas.

The National Restaurant Association gave a year-long salute to the NEA Centennial. There were NEA Centennial place mats, paper napkins, seal stickers, and menu and program covers.

At the Centennial Convention there were special Centennial exhibits of student efforts in the fine arts and industrial arts. The Philadelphia schools developed for the Centennial Convention a massive pageant entitled "Schools on Parade."

The most important convention feature for the Centennial was a special Centennial Convocation. The speakers included Waurine Walker of the Texas Education Agency, James B. Conant, recently retired as United States Ambassador to Germany, and Norman Cousins, Editor of *The Saturday Review*. After these speeches, the participants met in 115 circles of about 10 persons each. Each circle was asked to report on what, in its opinion, was the key concern of education in the years ahead. Some of the major points which thus emerged were:

How to prepare students for living in the atomic age
The role of international understanding
Appreciation for democracy and the national heritage
The importance of individual difference
An adequate sense of values
Life-long education
Re-evaluation of teacher preparation
Recognition and rewards for the teaching profession
Better communication for public interest in education
Qualifications for school board members
Close relations between home and school
Re-evaluation of school tax structure
Local control of schools

The Association received messages of congratulations from many United States organizations and many overseas teachers' organizations. One of the most unusual and appreciated citations took the form of a military review and parade by the Military District of Washington, D.C., United States Army, in honor of the NEA and its President.

Congressional relations

Chapter XV on Federal School Legislation traces in some detail the hearings and other Congressional activities incidental to the consideration and enactment of Federal aid to education. That material need not be repeated here.

However, the Congress deals with many matters of concern to education other than the crucial questions of school finance.

I shall here recount my activities as a witness at Congressional hearings other than those on federal funding for education.

The section will conclude with a few observations about Congressional hearings as a part of the legislative process.

The Fulbright Act

In February 1946, I spoke before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs on S.1636, "A Bill to Amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944." The apparently lackluster, routine nature of this legislation left plenty of vacant seats both for the members of the Committee and the general public.

I believe that I was the only representative from the educational organizations to testify for this measure. Nevertheless, this measure was, as it turned out, the most important item of international education exchange legislation ever enacted by the United States Congress. It is now generally called the Fulbright Act, or (more recently) the Fulbright-Hays Act.

The Fulbright programs became the largest planned effort of educational exchange in the history of the world. On the 30th Anniversary of the Program, the State Department announced that, under its provisions, over 120,000 scholars had experienced, extensively and intensively, an educational and social environment other than their own. The dividends, in terms of knowledge and understanding, have been incalculable.

UNESCO Charter

On April 4, 1946, I testified before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the approval of the UNESCO Charter. Unlike the United Nations Charter, the UNESCO Charter seemed to require the approval of both Houses of Congress since the legislation included the establishment and support of the proposed United States National Commission on UNESCO. I tried to show (1) that UNESCO was a useful and necessary institution for the achievement of the goals of American policy; (2) that the organization commanded strong support among the American people; and (3) that the UNESCO Constitution conforms to the constitutional procedures and usage of the United States with regard to education.

International exchanges

On May 12, 1954, I appeared before the State Department Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. The subject was HR.5087, the State-Justice-Commerce Appropriation Bill for 1955. At issue was the appropriation for international educational exchanges.

The President had singled out this operation for favorable attention in his Budget Message and had recommended an appropriation of $15 million. The House, where money bills originate, had cut this by 40 percent to $9 million. We were trying to get the Senate to restore as much as possible of the original budget.

The consequences of the House action had been discussed by other witnesses; my objective was not to repeat this testimony but rather to emphasize the values of international exchanges, especially of teachers, to the United States.

I pointed out that the NEA had devoted a substantial part of its own funds to international exchange. The Association and its members neither expected nor desired to receive any of the funds which we were asking the Senate to restore. I said that the original price tag of $15 million was a real bargain—less than one-third the cost of a destroyer. Most of the cut was ultimately restored.

The Economic Report

On February 3, 1955, I found myself facing the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report of the President, Senator Douglas of Illinois presiding. I told the Committee what I knew about school construction needs. There was some discussion of the President's school plan. Senator Goldwater said that the President's plan was "the most useful and workable plan I have ever seen." The Senator had been badly misinformed.

Office of Education budget

Next year, March 26, 1956, I was before the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. I was again supporting the full budget of the Office of Education as recommended by the President. It was a pleasant change for me to be supporting the President for once. The cuts in the Office of Education budget which had been made by the House of Representatives were substantially restored by the Senate.

Postal rates

On April 8, 1956, I was back on "the Hill," this time before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on HR.9228.

This proposal would have taken from the Congress the prerogative of determining the preferential postage rates for educational and other nonprofit institutions and organizations. It would have given that control to a proposed new Commission on Postal Rates. We argued that Congress had a sound policy to encourage educational use of the mails and that the Congress could not continue that policy if it surrendered its present rights to control the postal charges for such service. Our effort was successful.

Rural library and education-beyond-high-school grants

On May 7, 1957, I testified before the Labor-HEW Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations on HR.6287. We supported the Administration's budget for the United States Office of Education, rural library service grants, and the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School. I believe we were successful.

Telstar

In August 1962 I appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate in support of Project Telstar. The purpose was to claim for education a share in the federal revenue accruing from use of the public domain in the form of newly-allocated channels of communication via satellites.

Support for overseas schools

In the midst of our efforts to secure substantial federal funds for public education, the NEA became involved in a controversy with the Defense Department. The disagreement concerned the schools operated by the Defense Department for the children of American service men and women stationed overseas. The schools, considered collectively, constituted the tenth largest school system under the American flag. Congress had long ago voted that the salaries of teachers in these schools should be comparable to the salaries paid to teachers in large cities in the United States. However, the Defense Department, pleading lack of funds, did not put this decision of the Congress into effect. The Congress did not appropriate, and the Defense Department would not request, enough money to implement the law on teachers' salaries. The overseas schools should have been showcases of American education in the far corners of the world, but they ranged, in fact, from subaverage to deplorable. We were up against a tough military bureaucracy and an indifferent Congress.

On March 19, 1964, I presented this case before the Defense Department Subcommittee of the House of Representatives Committee on Appropriations. Several names which have since become very well known appear on the list of that Committee's members—including especially Representatives Gerald R. Ford of Michigan and Melvin Laird of Wisconsin. My testimony was fully documented. I appealed for justice for the American citizens who attended those schools, for their parents who were serving their country miles from home, for the teachers who had a right to the salaries provided by law. It was like trying to knock down the Empire State Building with a well-aimed rose petal. The teachers at long last had to appeal to the Courts. There, after initial reverses, they ultimately won back payments of some $20 million.

International Education Act

On April 7, 1966, I testified before the International Education Task Force of the House Committee on Education and Labor on HR.12451. This legislation appeared to be directed only, or at least chiefly, to the colleges and universities. My chief point was to persuade the Task Force to recommend language to make funds available to improve international understanding of elementary and secondary school teachers, as well as of the college teachers to whom the proposed legislation was originally directed. All of this was related to the Administration proposal called "The International Education Act of 1966." It was signed by President Johnson October 29, 1966 and is now Public Law 89-698.

As a follow-up to this legislation, President Johnson early in 1967 requested that a major international conference on education be held. An international planning committee of some thirty persons was organized. We met in February, 1967, decided that the international conference would meet in October, 1967, that the theme would be "The World Crisis in Education," and that the site of the Conference would be Williamsburg, Virginia. After the Conference I served on a small Follow-up Committee.

The President himself attended the Williamsburg Conference and addressed a dinner session. Unfortunately, the preoccupation of the press with Vietnam at the time, combined with some faults in the planning of the Conference itself, prevented substantial results. Between the people who did not want the Conference to discuss Vietnam at all and the people who wanted to discuss nothing else, the announced theme of the Conference was lost. Like so many other bright initiatives of that day the value of the Conference was thus severely impaired.

Bilingual education

My last official appearance before a Congressional committee came on May 19, 1967, before the Special Subcommittee on Bilingual Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The subject of the hearing was S.428, an amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The purpose of the amendment was to give special assistance to the Spanish-speaking children in the public schools of the United States. This was a bipolar problem centering chiefly about the Mexican-American children of the Southwest and the Cuban refugee and Puerto Rican children along the Eastern Seaboard and the Gulf Coast. On behalf of the NEA membership in these regions and on behalf of NEA members elsewhere, I strongly urged the adoption of this amendment.

The proposed amendments were adopted, providing new programs in dropout prevention and in special education for handicapped children, as well as in bilingual education and institutes for training teachers of bilingual classes. It became Public Law 90-247, and was signed by President Johnson on January 2, 1968.

Having discovered somehow that this would be my last appearance for the NEA on Capitol Hill, the Senators of the Committee wound up their session with me by saying some kind words about my long-term efforts to inform the Congress about educational problems and conditions. Senator Ralph Yarborough of Texas, the Subcommittee Chairperson, and Senators Paul Fannin of Arizona and Robert Kennedy of New York joined in offering congratulations. The Committee then paused for photographs of this occasion, after which I took my leave of the United States Congress, except as a continuously interested and sometimes bewildered observer.

Procedures at Committee hearings

Congressional hearings, on the whole, are a weary and ineffective ritual. Few members of Congress experience a change of mind as a result of something said at a hearing. Actually the attendance by members of Congress is very irregular. The question period is usually partisan rather than informative.

To save time (or so it is claimed) the testimony is nearly always written in advance. Witnesses are often required to file enough copies of their testimony so that each committee member may read the testimony in advance. The slowest reader in Congress can read silently more rapidly than the fastest-talking witness. However, it is doubtful that the testimony is read in advance in one percent of the cases.

Most Congressional hearing rooms are badly designed. The Committee is seated on a raised dais. The witness, in order to see the members of the committee must look steeply upward. But he or she cannot look up and read testimony at the same time. If the witness deserts her or his intention to read and tries to look the committee in the eye while testifying, she or he is almost sure to suffer a real pain in the neck.

The ordinary Congressional hearing bears almost no likeness to the dramatic televised sessions of the Senate Watergate hearings or those of the House Judiciary Committee considering the impeachment of President Richard Nixon. In routine situations, attendance by all committee members is rare. Committee members wander in and out of the hearing room. A few spectators take notes and draw doodles. A couple of young newspaper reporters, slowly expiring in boredom because they have heard it all before, sit still desperately hoping that someone will say something exciting enough to provide the lead for their story, which the editor probably will not publish anyway. Little groups of tourists peer into the hearing room from the outer hall. A few of these enter and take a seat but soon depart in search of greater excitement.

At a staggering cost skilled stenotypists take down every word uttered, and thus every syllable finds its way into the archives of the Congress. Sooner or later, the full text of the hearing rolls soggily off the Government Printing Office press and is rarely seen again.

Because every bit of pending legislation "dies" at the end of each two-year Congress, the same or similar testimony is apt to be repeated a number of times. Repetition of testimony occurs on all measures because of the bicameral nature of the Congress.

It may be supposed from the foregoing comments that I regard Congressional hearings as an inefficient method of considering the pros and cons of pending measures. That is indeed the case. One thinks, "Oh, there *must* be a better way than this!"

One change would save at least 50 percent of the money, time, and energy which are now being poured into the Congressional hearing mill. Let all committees of the Congress be Joint Committees of the House and Senate. After holding joint hearings, both Houses would begin with identical evidence. The Senate and House components of the Joint Committee could then meet separately and make separate reports. They might also be empowered not only to hold hearings jointly but also, if they voted to do so, to make identical reports. In this latter event the time now consumed in the cumbersome Conference Committee procedures would be substantially reduced. A number of Joint Committees already exist. I see no valid reason why the joint hearings would impair the independence of action of each House. A further substantial gain in efficiency could be achieved if, instead of being subject to the present annual review, ordinary continuing appropriations were made to cover a two-year period.

One minor but helpful change would be the installation of a reading lectern at the place where the witnesses ordinarily are seated. Standing-up testimony would help in at least three ways. It would enable the witnesses and the committee members to speak to each other eye-to-eye. Second, it would do away with the inappropriate courtroom atmosphere which now prevails in committee hearings. Third, and, at least equally important, it would encourage witnesses to be brief.

In spite of the difficulties inherent in the present Congressional hearing procedures, I have myself been invariably treated with courtesy and kindness by the committee members. Not all of them have agreed with me all the time; a few have disagreed most of the time. Yet they always showed in my presence a genuine concern about the schools and colleges of the country. This continued concern for the nation's educational systems is one reason our schools are as good as they are.

20 Evaluation

A summation, 1952-67 - Job description - Meetings - Field work - Writing - Contacts - The daily grind - Methods and principles of work - Farewells - Since then

A summation, 1952-1967

Each year during my terms as NEA Executive Secretary I used to request a brief half-page report from each unit on its major achievements and on the major events of the year. Then I combined these lists and circulated them to all staff members. It was a device intended to develop pride and a sense of teamwork in a staff which was extraordinarily unaware of events in the NEA outside of any one particular unit.

Late in 1967 someone put together this list of NEA achievements during my administration as a statement to be enclosed with the solicitation for funds by the NEA to establish the William G. Carr Scholarship Award.

Some of the major points in that list follow:

Creation of eight NEA regional offices

Annual meetings of the Presidents of the Affiliated State Associations

Establishment of an Urban Services Division with twelve full-time employees in Washington and six field workers

Professional negotiations inaugurated and widely established

Assistance in state and local crisis situations

Employment of four consultants on teachers' salaries

The NEA school for professional negotiations

The NEA school on teachers' salaries

The local projects recognition program

The Hilda Maehling fellowships

The Time To Teach project

Expansion of the program of the Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities

Extension of the program of the Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards

Support of the National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education

Citizenship clinics

The Student NEA at the college level

The Committee on Civil and Human Rights

Full-time staff for the Ethics Committee

The two-year NEA Development Project

Three new NEA joint committees–with the American Textbook Publishers Institute, the Magazine Publishers Association, and the National School Boards Association

Increased staff in Lay Relations

Strengthening the NEA Research Division

Completely revised policy and format for the NEA Research Bulletin

Computer processing for use in the Research, Business Management, and Membership Records Division

Development and use of sampling techniques for national surveys of teachers' opinions

A revised *NEA Journal* with more varied content, special inserts, better covers,and more color

Distribution of the *NEA Reporter* to all members

Editorial information centers established in New York City and on the West Coast

The Educational Broadcast Service

The Annual Conference on School Finance

The School Bell Awards

The Pacemaker Schools Awards

The NEA Photographic Service

The Center for the Study of Instruction

Teaching Career Month

Substantial increases in the production of NEA films, filmstrips, and television promotions

Consultant services in Educational Television and in Elementary Education

Full-time staff in Adult Education

Special projects in Automation, Juvenile Delinquency, Dropouts, Talented Pupils, English Composition

The NEA Teacher Corps

Full-time Convention Coordinator

Acquisition and development of the National Training Laboratory in Bethel, Maine

Increased Regional Conferences on Instruction

Two field offices for the NEA Travel Division

Construction, funding, management, equipment, operation, and maintenance of the new NEA Center

The NEA Visitors' Center

Increased financial support for NEA delegates, officers, and committees

Handling records for more than twice as many members in 1967 as in 1952

Enlarged Legislative Commission resources to secure major breakthroughs in federal support for education

Achievement by law and by regulation of equity in income tax treatment for teachers

Million Dollar Fund for Teacher Rights

NEA Mutual Fund

NEA Insurance Trust

The foregoing is not a list of NEA achievements and certainly not a list of personal achievements. It is a list of NEA activities and services as of 1967 which were not in the NEA program in 1952.

Job description

If I ask myself what I was doing between 1952 and 1967 I can write a kind of catalog of activities.

1. *Meetings.* To begin with the most obvious responsibility, the NEA Executive Secretary* attends a great many meetings. There is little option in most of these situations. The NEA is a large and complex organization with several different governing bodies the meetings of which must be attended by the Executive Secretary. In 1965-66 the total of these meetings and directly related activities came to over 130 working days per year.
2. *Field work.* A systematic record of my work outside of Washington showed that I was spending an average of 126 days per year in field work. In retrospect, I think I spent too much time in this area of activity.
3. *Writing.* A third category of activity involves the preparation of articles, speeches, and testimony for Congressional committees.

For me, speeches could rarely be ghost-written. A speech or an article of substantial importance needs to be pungent and profound, rational and stimulating, to conform to NEA policy, avoid dull repetition, and have some structure which holds it together. It should reflect the thought, the personality, and the style of its author. The need to be concise is one reason why such statements can rarely be made *ad lib,* at least not by me.

4. *Contacts.* In addition to attendance at meetings, field work, and writing, a wide variety of *contacts with individuals and groups* needs to be maintained. These include, for example, many members of Congress, White House officials, Cabinet

---

*In 1975 the title was changed to Executive Director. I believe the change in nomenclature is a good one.

officers concerned with education, members of the Defense Department concerned with training in the Armed Forces, members of the United States Foreign Service who serve overseas as advisers to AID missions, leaders in business and industry, comparable officers for other professions such as medicine and law, leaders of other national teachers' organizations, officials of the United Nations and UNESCO insofar as their work involves education, university presidents and others in higher education, men and women involved in the preparation of teachers, scholars in various disciplines related to education, leaders in the news media and in the formation of public opinion, editors and columnists, civil rights leaders, leaders of veterans' and civic organizations. This area could easily absorb all the effort and more than any one person could devote to it. Of course, the Executive Secretary had to delegate a great deal of it to others.

5. The fifth area of activity may be described briefly as *the daily grind.* It required the Executive Secretary to relate swiftly to a kaleidoscope of essentially unrelated personalities, events, issues, and problems. In the course of staff routine, most of the easy problems are sorted out and handled by others. Only the points of controversy, the frustrations, and the emergencies get to the Executive Secretary.

Methods and principles of work

What was done is perhaps less important than the spirit and methods by which it was accomplished. To deal objectively with this kind of question is extremely difficult, but I will venture a few observations.

I tried to discipline myself to remember that the Association exists for the purposes stated in its Charter. It is not, for example, an agency for the general promotion of civil rights or international peace. Although I have strong personal views in favor of both of these areas, as Executive Secretary of the NEA I believed my energies should be directed to educational objectives. Many people, of course, try to *use* the Association to advance various other purposes, but the Executive Secretary, like other officers, may not acquiescence in such usage whether the goal be personal power or the highest altruism. The Executive Secretary is not debarred from endeavoring to influence the decisions of the Association; indeed, in my opinion, he or she is required to try to influence policy decisions by all the legitimate methods of evidence and persuasion.

One of the Executive Secretary's duties is to appoint, or to recommend to the Executive Committee, the principal members of the professional staff as well as to give informal advice regarding other appointments. On important new appointments, I usually named an independent task force from staff and field to search possibilities and to recommend three to five names to me. All such appointments require great care. It is difficult but imperative to avoid being influenced by friendship or by other external considerations.

To the person entering my office, his or her needs and interests were paramount. That person usually had given much time and thought to the topic to be discussed and was often well-launched on the presentation of a problem before I could drag my mind away from the issue posed by the previous visitor.

Almost everyone, I found, wants a chance to be consulted on every topic which even remotely touches her or his interests. Almost no one, however, wants the responsibility of decision on difficult issues, even in the fields in which she or he is most competent.

The habit of trying to perceive specific issues in the light of possible future developments was, I think, highly important. The ability to differentiate the temporary issues on which a snap judgment is satisfactory from issues which, however trifling they seem, still have long-range consequences, is crucial. This ability, more than any other trait, is a component of what people usually call "good judgment." I do not know whether I possess this quality; I am sure I did not have as much of it as I should. But I believe that whatever I possess of it was developed by experience. I doubt whether good judgment can be created by intelligence or by devotion, together or separately. I think experience is an essential added ingredient.

One other aspect of my work is difficult to define but, perhaps for that reason, all the more necessary to mention. I will call it intellectual resilience—the capacity to recover from stress. I believe this quality depends first of all on reasonably good health—good enough to permit a long series of twelve-hour working days, seven-day weeks, and fifty-two-week years. In addition, it is developed by a good basic education, and further developed by continuous learning—in my case, chiefly but not solely, by reading.

The capacity to feel at home in the realm of ideas was, for me at least, a basic element in my work as NEA Executive Secretary. Whatever other daily demands arose, it seemed to me as imperative to continue one's education in this way as to be on time at committee meetings or to answer telegrams the same day.

Farewells

During the last few weeks of my service with the National Education Association, several social gatherings were held to honor my wife and me.

The first event was a dinner given for us in New York City in April 1967, by the Educational Policies Commission. I was given a handsomely-bound and very useful set of seven volumes containing all of the reports issued by the Commission during my fifteen years as an ex-officio member and the preceding seventeen years as its Secretary.

In Boston, a few days later, the NEA Department of Elementary School Principals set aside one morning of its large national convention to honor my wife and me. The Department brought together at that time as speakers four of our good friends from various parts of the world: Sir Ronald Gould of England (President of the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession); Tai Si Chung (Secretary of the Korean Federation of Education Associations); Dr. Andrew Holt (President of the University of Tennessee and a member of the NEA Board of Trustees); and Mrs. Sarah Caldwell (Past-President of the NEA, former Chairperson of the Educational Policies Commission, and member of the WCOTP Executive Committee).

In May the NEA gave a very large black-tie farewell dinner for us in Washington at the Mayflower Hotel. The Ballroom was packed—both ground floor and galleries. Senator Ralph Yarborough brought personal greetings from President Johnson. The NEA President read a very friendly letter from Vice-President Hubert H. Humphrey. Stephen Wright, then Director of the United Negro College Fund, spoke about my work with the Educational Policies Commission. Luther Evans, Director of International and Legal Collections at Columbia University Library and a former Director-General of UNESCO, spoke about my international activities. Paul Miller, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, discussed my work with the Federal Government. Lois

Edinger, NEA Past-President, spoke about my work as Executive Secretary. My wife and I were each presented with very handsome and eloquent leather-bound illuminated citations. A small book of excerpts from some of my papers and speeches was distributed. The entire proceedings were entered in the *Congressional Record.*

In June, Dr. Ole Sand, Director of the NEA Center for Instruction, arranged a luncheon for us at the University Club. This was a relatively small gathering to which Dr. Sand invited some of the leaders in the work of the Center, together with our old friend, William Benton, who chaired the Board of the Encyclopedia Britannica. Because of some ambiguity in the wording of the invitation, Mr. Benton had the impression that the luncheon would be a large public gathering. Accordingly, he prepared a substantial written address for the occasion. That paper contained, I believe, the most discriminating praise of any which was currently being heaped upon my bowed and defenseless head. Among other things, he compared me to a laser beam in several ingenious respects. It was much too clever to be limited to a few people. Thus I was told that Senator Abraham Ribicoff, adding a few kind words of his own, had the text of the laser beam eulogy printed in the *Congressional Record.* At the luncheon Mr. Benton ended his remarks by presenting us with a handsome set of the Britannica as well as the three-volume Dictionary. My wife, however, paid me the highest compliment of the day; she said the Britannica would be so handy to consult on any topic whenever I was not at home.

The final colossal fling in the series came in the Minneapolis Civic Auditorium on July 4, during the annual meeting of the 7,000 or so members of the NEA Delegate Assembly. A number of NEA staff members had worked long and skillfully to develop a three-way, three-screen slide-film presentation with narration by Douglas Edwards. Under the title "A Child is to Teach" the presentation dealt, partly in my own words, with the issues which the Association had met during my term as Executive Secretary.

Dr. Andrew Holt spoke on my NEA activities before 1952; Mrs. Sarah Caldwell on international activities; and Arthur Corey, retiring Executive Secretary of the California Teachers Association, on my work as NEA Executive Secretary. Clarice Kline, Past-President of the NEA, presented my wife with a smaller copy of my portrait which hangs in a gallery of the NEA building. The Committee created by the Board of Directors to arrange a special project for my retirement announced the establishment of the William G. Carr

Scholarship Fund. One such Scholarship is awarded each year, the young recipients alternating between those interested in improvement of professional organizations and those interested in international relations in education. I was also given a book of letters—one from each of the secretaries of the NEA-affiliated state education associations.

Since then

After leaving office in WCOTP in 1972, I have been rather idle. I have written these memoirs, I have responded to occasional requests for articles and speeches, and papers for university-sponsored conferences. I have on invitation done a little graduate teaching. It has been my experience that the number of requests for such services diminishes very rapidly after retirement.

In 1936, Dr. P. W. Kuo, a distinguished Chinese scholar and diplomat, called on me to discuss the formation of a Sino-American Cultural Society in Washington. I had known Dr. Kuo ever since the war years when he represented China at the meetings which created at Atlantic City the United Nations Relief and Reconstruction Agency and at Bretton Woods, New Hampshire, the United Nations International Monetary Fund. Dr. Kuo had also represented China, between the two world wars, at several meetings of the old World Federation of Education Associations, including the founding Assembly at San Francisco-Oakland in 1923. He and Mrs. Kuo, who happened to live in the same apartment house as we did, became our close friends.

Dr. Kuo became the Founder and first President of the Sino-American Cultural Society. He felt that the Vice-President should be an American so as to stress the bilateral nature of the Society sponsorship, and I agreed to serve in that capacity.

When Dr. Kuo was struck by a disabling illness in 1967, I presided temporarily at various activities of the Society. When Dr. Kuo died in 1969 I was elected to the Presidency with a Chinese Vice-President. I still continue and enjoy this responsibility.

For these and other services the Government of China on January 20, 1978, conferred on me the decoration and citation called "Order of the Brilliant Star," with grand cordon.

In 1957 I had helped to establish and develop the Council on International Non-theatrical Events (CINE) which has as its chief function the evaluation and supply of United States documentary films to participate in about eighty film festivals, mostly annual events, held throughout the world. Such activities are elsewhere carried out by the participating governments, but the United States has not provided machinery or funds for such participation. The work therefore must be done by volunteers. Because of my early help in launching CINE I was made in 1964 an Honorary Patron.

Beginning in 1970 I was elected to four successive one-year terms as President of the Council. I do not possess technical competence in this area, but I did acquire some insight during the four years. I believe CINE wanted someone who was not a technician, who could preside at meetings, and who could deal impartially when differences of opinion or emphasis arose among the members of the governing body.

To end on a personal note, I will report that in 1974 my wife and I celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of our marriage. We invited a few of our closest friends to a short series of small dinners in our home—occasions on which my wife is really highly expert. We went to California for a series of reunions with the surviving members of our wedding party and other old friends and relatives. Our son and daughter-in-law, ably assisted by our three grandsons, gave us a beautiful anniversary dinner in La Jolla. In November, my wife's sister and her husband gave us a cocktail-buffet reception at their home in Chevy Chase, Maryland, attended by nearly 100 of my former NEA colleagues and other friends of ours acquired during our nearly half-century in Washington.